DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 386 HE 012 123

AUTHOR	Hull, W. Frank, IV: And Others
TITLE	The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs. CIEE Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange No. 20.
INSTITUTION	Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	76p.: For related document see HE 012 125
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on International Educational Exchange, 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Students: Educational Assessment: Evaluation Criteria: Evaluation Methods: Geographic Location: Higher Education: *International Educational Exchange: *Off Campus Facilities: *Program Effectiveness: Student Development: *Student Experience: *Study Abroad
IDENTIFIERS	*Nontraditional Education

ABSTRACT

Specific goals sought by a group of off-campus study program directors were identified in an effort to develop an appropriate instrument for assessing whether the student participants perceived these goals as having been actualized within themselves. An Individual Opinion Inventory was developed for this purpose. Students participating in overseas programs and domestic off-campus programs were surveyed. Variables that are considered include: demographic characteristics: previous off-campus experience: program characteristics: student attitudes: and consequences of the program. Student responses were gathered before and after the off-campus experiences. Statistical data are tabulated and comparisons of these responses are discussed. The results indicate that as a consequence of the students' educational experiences, many behavioral and attitudinal changes were apparent. Generally these changes involved an increased awareness of others, and of other cultures. The off-campus students tended to recommend their programs highly. It was also noted that no clear or general superiority of off-campus overseas programs was demonstrated over off-campus domestic programs in altering student-reported perceptions of the affective areas under consideration. It is suggested that more changes may have occurred during the domestic programs than during the overseas programs. Appended are lists of majors and minors, foreign locations, domestic locations, and higher education institutions represented in the sample. A bibliography is included. (SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CIE OCCASIONAL PAPERS

on International Educational Exchange

No. 2

The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs

ED180386

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CIEE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Council on International Educational Exchange 777 UN Plaza New York NY 10017

2

Price: $3.00 per copy

Copyright © 1977 by the
Council on International Educational Exchange
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs

W. Frank Hull IV
Walter H. Lemke, Jr.
Richard Ting-ku Houang

University of California
Santa Barbara, California

January 1977

The research reported herein was performed pursuant through a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD, Otto Klineberg i

INTRODUCTION iii

Part I: The Study

CHAPTERS:

I. Development of the Study and the Instrument 1

II. Samples and Design 5

Part II: Analyses

III. Percentage Responses 9

IV. Responses Prior to the Sojourn 15

V. Responses Following the Sojourn 23

VI. Responses By Matched Pairs 33

Part III: Consequences

VII. In Conclusion 49

APPENDICES:

A. Majors and Minors Represented in the Sample 53

B. Foreign Locations Represented in the Sample 54

C. Domestic Locations Represented in the Sample 54

D. Institutions of Higher Education Represented in the Sample 54

BIBLIOGRAPHY 57

"How much a dunce that has been sent to roam
Excels a dunce that has been kept at home."

William Cowper (1731 – 1800)

FOREWORD

My interest in the problems involved in the study of "The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas" goes back a long way. When I was with UNESCO in 1948-49 as Director of the Project on "Tensions Affecting International Understanding" and as Acting Head of the Social Sciences Department, my co-workers and I were faced with a serious challenge. We were in essence being asked by the international community whether the social sciences could make a contribution to understanding among nations, to cooperation and friendliness, and to the reduction of tensions.

One of the techniques that was widely advocated and that was regarded as being clearly calculated towards bringing the peoples of the world closer together was "the exchange of persons," the sending of people -- particularly young students -- from one country to another. This by itself would certainly not solve all international problems, but there was a pervasive faith and hope that it would make a substantial contribution toward creating the atmosphere in which the solution of such problems would become more probable.

Some skepticism was evident even then, directed not at the goals but at the value of the techniques advocated in order to reach them. What in fact is accomplished by the exchange of persons? To what extent are we really obtaining the results that we advocate? How good are our methods? How can they be improved so as to achieve their maximum effect?

On one occasion when this issue was being discussed in UNESCO, an Australian colleague volunteered a personal observation: "In Australia," he said, "the leaders of organizations and activities devoted to strengthening the bonds between members of the British Commonwealth and encouraging friendly attitudes toward the United Kingdom were all returned Rhodes Scholars, who, after spending two years or more at Oxford, came home full of enthusiasm for the mother country." He then added that the leaders of the movement for more complete independence for Australia and withdrawal from the Commonwealth were also all returned Rhodes Scholars. Nothing is proved, of course, by means of an anecdote, but it does state the problem in clear form. What are the effects of study abroad? Do they have different effects in different cases? If so, why?

When social scientists are asked about the effectiveness of programs designed to improve international relations or to contribute to the development of the persons involved, they sometimes will have to answer: "We don't know." There are issues, however, in which the response indicated is: "We don't know, but we can find out." The present piece represents a significant step in that direction. It adds to our knowledge of the consequences of study away from home on the students who participate in such programs. It distinguishes, wisely in my opinion, between the impact on the individuals who study abroad and those whose sojourn "away from home" takes place elsewhere within the United States. Using carefully constructed and well tested instruments on a varied and extensive sample of students, it brings objectivity and sophistication to the analysis of the impact of such an experience in a number of different situations.

During the past two years I have had the pleasure of working closely with Drs. Hull and Lemke in connection with another, although related, project. I have been impressed by their competence, their originality, their devotion to both pure and applied research, their earnest desire to improve the quality of human -- and particularly international -- relationships. The present piece testifies to their possession of these qualities.

Otto Klineberg

Director, International Center for Intergroup Relations
Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris

Professor Emeritus of Social Psychology
Columbia University, New York

June, 1976
Paris, France

INTRODUCTION

In the words of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights:*

> Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.[1]

As one component of this kind of education, study off campus involves many young Americans, who participate in organized programs or who proceed on their own. Unfortunately, we know little about how such experiences influence these students. We assume that they develop certain cognitive skills – students in formal study programs typically present some certification which is extrapolated into academic credit at the home institution. Yet the goal of education, as described in the above cited document, is much more than the acquisition of cognitive skills. A liberal arts education has always been a perspective, not a formula. Like the philosophical and theological undergirdings of our society, it posits that the individual is unique and deserves the opportunity to develop his or her potential in all domains to the fullest extent. Education in this sense includes the development of moral responsibilities as well as intellectual faculties.

At present little is known about the impact of collegiate education upon the individual's affective concepts or values. When the American undergraduate who studies off campus is specifically considered, even less is known. As has been publicly admitted about overseas programs in particular:

> Obviously we are working on faith because we really have very little evidence of what happens as a result of international educational experience. I see no reason to be quite so ignorant as we are now, having been in the business twenty years.[2]

Rendered in 1967, this observation remains valid today.[3] The need for understanding as well as accountability – in every sense – applies to off-campus educational programs, both domestic and international.

"Travel, in the younger sort," reminded Francis Bacon, "is part of education; in the elder, a part of experience." Like Bacon, there have always been those who believed that travel abroad was, in fact, "part of education." Until recently, however, only the rich were able to act on Bacon's observation. After the Second World War, American society witnessed an increase in college and university programs providing students with not only the opportunity to travel abroad during their undergraduate years, but also the opportunity to participate in study abroad programs while earning credit toward their college degree at their home institutions. The programs varied significantly. Many were considered honors programs for the academically superior student, while some were structured for particular majors – for example, modern language or architecture majors. Many students received financial aid from public or private sources, while some faculty members from the home institution functioned as on-site directors. Underlying these programs is the assumption that the experience of studying and living in another culture overseas is educationally valuable in itself.

Yet what specifically is the educational value gained by a student studying in another culture? Some say that it forms the basis for building bridges of interdependencies between peoples and among nations; others say it increases mutual understanding or international respect for a reconstituted human community. Whatever its definition, advocates see the value to be very real, while skeptics point to a lack of systematic evidence to support that assumption.

Recently, some have claimed a decline in the number of students involved in off-campus overseas education – however temporary or permanent. Data exhibit a 23% decrease in the number of all study abroad programs available to students on American campuses from 1971/72 to 1973/74, with a corresponding drop of 38% in the number of undergraduates involved.[4] Winter or academic year programs also underwent a significant change: a 45% decline in the number of under-

graduate students during the same period.[5] The escalating costs of overseas programs certainly accounted for part of this alleged decline, but other factors were also involved.

Increasingly, there are other off-campus programs, similar in many respects to those abroad, which operate within this country. Undergraduate students can participate in accredited programs, for example, in varying placed like Washington, D.C., New York City, San Francisco, Dowling (Michigan), Nanjemoy (Maryland), and La Plant (South Dakota). Some of these programs also claim to possess the educational value of the experience of studying and living in another culture, pointing out dramatically that Philadelphia's Germantown area or San Francisco's Tenderloin is certainly "another culture" to the student from the farmlands of Kansas. One brochure asserts in bold print: "SPEND A SEMESTER IN ANOTHER WORLD," referring to a community internship program in the same small community in which the college itself is located! Usually less expensive and often more open to students than are overseas programs, off-campus domestic efforts tend to offer a particular opportunity to study and learn while living away from the home campus. Typically these programs consist of seminars relevant to the location plus time spent working, assisting or observing a selected problem or component of the local community.

In this present report the authors have attempted to portray the complex nature of a project aimed precisely at ameliorating our understanding of off-campus educational programs. The authors have tried to assess the educational validity of some programs for American undergraduates in terms of perceived changes wrought in the American undergraduate participants. Obviously a difficult topic – especially as any measurement is suspect in many circles today – the assessment of self-perceived cognitive and affective changes has required careful design and implementation. As this phase of the project ends, the chances of success have increased. Yet this report must be read in light of the fact the work is still in progress and time must pass before a longitudinal assessment of the impact of the off-campus study experience is possible. The impact of what has often been referred to as the "sleeper effect" cannot be estimated in advance. It is appropriate, however, to share what we have discovered as this phase ends.

The project was funded by the United States Office of Education, under the authority of Title VI, Section 602, NDEA. Mrs. Julia A. Petrov, Research Chief, always extended valuable advice and insight as the project progressed. In addition to the Government grant, complementary funds were made available from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., through the office of Dr. Landrum R. Bolling. These funds were expended to conduct early student interviews in Tokyo.

The initial impetus for the instrument designed for this assessment task was generated during a series of in-depth interviews with personnel at various institutions associated with the Great Lakes Colleges Association and what was then the Regional Council for International Education. These professionals were asked not only to specify the precise formal and informal goals of their programs but also to identify those aspects of off-campus study which they considered to be indicators of a "successful" experience. Among others, the following people were consulted and offered counsel and assistance in various ways and at various times: Irwin Abrams; Henry Acres; Samuel Biedler; Stevens Brooks; Knud Helms-Eriksen; David Hoopes; Lewis Hoskins; Dorothy Hyatt; Joyce Karsko; Charles Kegley; James Keith; Frederick Klein; Thomas Knipp; Donald Myers; William Petrek; Lucille Ribble; Paula Spier; Richard Stavig; Roy Turley; Roy Wenger; Jens Winther; and Richard Woods.

Ivan Putman, Jr., from the State University of New York, and William Allaway, from the University of California, offered their advice during the formative stages of the project. Valwyn Hooper at Santa Barbara helped in correcting drafts of several sections. Margaret E. Sherman at the Council on International Educational Exchange provided effective editorial assistance. Our colleague on another project, Otto Klineberg, was also kind enough to offer technical opinions whenever asked. All of these people contributed their time and efforts freely.

As members of the initial team, Steven Jurs, Leo Leonard and Marshall Davies worked long and hard. G.E. Dickson, Dean at the University of Toledo, was exceptionally supportive of this work. Chancellor Vernon I. Cheadle has been equally encouraging here at the University of California at Santa Barbara, even reading drafts of various documents on very short notice.

Indeed, many individuals interested in higher education have contributed to this effort. We have learned a great deal about the phenomenon of off-campus education – what it is and what it does. Ultimately, of course, the authors assume full responsibility for what appears in this report.

W. Frank Hull IV
Walter H. Lemke, Jr.
Richard Ting-ku Houang

30 June, 1976
The University of California at Santa Barbara

Footnotes: Introduction

[1] *Universal Declaration of Human Rights,* UNESCO, Article 26, 2 (1948); cf., "International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights," adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (1966), especially Article 13.

[2] James M. Davis, as quoted in Allan A. Michie, ed., *Diversity and Independence Through International Education* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967), pp. 70-71.

[3] A review of literature concerning overseas off-campus educational programs can be found in the *Interim Report,* pp. 3-14, presented to the Office of Education, International Studies Branch, in March, 1974, and in Hull and Lemke, "The Assessment of Off-Campus Higher Education," *International Review of Education,* XXI (2), 1975.

[4] Leonard P. Iaquinta, *et al.,* "International and Intercultural Education in the United States," in Larry A. Kubal, ed., *1974-75 Annual Report of the World Studies Data Bank* (New York: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1975), p. 25; p. 18, Table 7.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 81.

Chapter I

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY AND THE INSTRUMENT[1]

In this report,

> . . . it is assumed that the ultimate goal of international exchanges is to contribute to friendly and peaceful relations among the peoples of the world, but that many more immediate goals relating to technical cooperation, changes in institutions, success in academic training, increased knowledge about foreign cultures, preparation for a useful career, readiness to cooperate in international undertakings, etc., may all require consideration.[2]

The task for this project was thus to identify the specific goals sought by a group of highly qualified off-campus study program directors and to develop an appropriate instrument to assess whether or not the student participants perceived these goals as having been actualized within themselves.

In all of this, a crucial distinction needs to be remembered: *assessment* refers to the process of studying the results of a particular event or series of events upon an individual or individuals, both qualitatively and quantitatively; *evaluation* is the process of taking the data and concepts discovered in assessment and adding a value judgment to these data. For example, in an *assessment* study one might discover that 98% of the sample population being studied reported accepting X theory and acted accordingly. When one begins to make statements implying the value or lack thereof (i.e., good or bad) of any of these data, one has moved to the level of an *evaluation* statement.

It should be understood that the present study is one of *assessment,* in which the goal is to produce particular data on specific study experiences in both a macro and a micro sense. Only after the data are produced and presented does it become the option of various educational leaders – including the directors of off-campus study programs – to make judgments concerning the value of the programs (i.e., evaluation).

In order to accomplish this assessment task, an instrument entitled the "Individual Opinion Inventory" (also referred to as the "IOI") was developed. In this instrument the attempt was made to encourage individuals who were highly respected in the area of off-campus educational programs to specify the precise formal and informal goals of their programs and also to identify those factors which, in their view, determined whether students had a "good" or "poor" experience.

Phase 1 of the research, lasting from May, 1972 to March, 1974, centered on the formation of the IOI. Much of that time was spent in lengthy sessions pushing experts to focus their thoughts and to enunciate their goals. After more discussion, reassessment, and categorization, the bulk of the information filtered into general areas and finally into individual items; whereupon the whole procedure was repeated twice.

Due to the complexity of the task, the team thought a pre-pilot testing of the IOI would be helpful prior to conducting further revisions of the instrument's items. The pre-pilot was conducted between

October 1 and November 30, 1972, at the Great Lakes Colleges Association institutions and especially at Kalamazoo College through the cooperation of Professor Richard T. Stavig. Only students who had returned to the home campus from an off-campus overseas program for fall, 1972, were sampled. This testing resulted in a revision of the IOI overseas form during January, 1973.

Various assumptions and item wordings were then checked by the project director, with students participating in off-campus educational programs at the following locations: Bogota, Colombia; Cuernavaca, Mexico; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New York, New York; and Tokyo, Japan. Further revisions were then made.

Three forms of the IOI were under simultaneous development:

> Form A, for students returning from an off-campus experience *outside* of the political boundaries of the United States.
>
> Form B, for students returning from an off-campus experience *within* the political boundaries of the United States.
>
> Form C, for students in their sophomore or junior year who had participated in *no* off-campus study.

Between March and September, 1973, data were collected,[3] resulting in completed returns from students who had studied at 62 foreign locations and at 36 domestic locations; representing 32 institutions of postsecondary education in the United States. The responses numbered 378 students on Form A, 246 on Form B, and 110 on Form C.

The technical sections, involving the validity and the reliability of the Phase I instruments, may be found in the *Interim Report*.[4] Similarly, there exists in the same document a discussion of the "Interpretation of Findings," to which the reader is referred for a detailed description.[5] Certainly it is more important to summarize the results that emerged from this first phase of the research.

The project, during Phase I, did locate various interrelating variables, but the experimental nature of an instrument under development during this first phase, as well as the varying means by which different on-campus directors sampled their students, made it impossible to go much beyond the mere listing of what could be called "emerging results."

Of these, the following are the most intriguing:

First, the replies of students responding to the instrument were analyzed to ascertain if background characteristics varied systematically with program outcomes. It was discovered that students of different academic majors responded differently, with students in the humanities scoring category items significantly more favorably than students in the sciences. This pattern of differences of associations with a student's major field of study occurred more frequently on Form A than on Form B or C. This was in keeping with what prior research would have hypothesized.

Second, associations of statistical significance were found between the then 13 experimental categories of the instrument and (1) the student's present interest in the area of the off-campus study; (2) the student's present amount of reading about that area; and (3) the student's present amount of correspondence with individuals living in the off-campus study location. On Form A, those students who gave the most positive responses (i.e., claimed the most positive outcomes from their study experience) also indicated a sustained interest and involvement in the location of their off-campus study. These patterns emerged less frequently on Forms B and C.

Third, the length of stay at the off-campus location was closely associated with the outcomes as reported by the students on Form A, but not always in the same direction. For example, longer stays off campus were related to higher scores in experimental categories like "Comparing and Observing

Societies Different from One's Own," but they were also related to lower scores in the experimental category of "Developing Tolerance." Longer stays were also associated with reported improvement in foreign language fluency and increased use of the foreign language, as well as with a more positive image and a more positive evaluation of the instructional program at the off-campus study location.

Fourth, statistically significant differences existed between experimental category scores of students who studied in various locations throughout the world. In the five major geographical areas considered (Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Central and South America, and the Far East) the general pattern of responses indicated that students in non-European locations responded more positively on the various experimental categories.

Fifth, the presence of a "host family" or roommate resulted in no systematic differences in the scores of the experimental categories on Form A. The same result occurred on the roommate category on Form B.

In brief commentary on these tentative findings, differences linked to the student's major field of study are not surprising. One might reasonably expect that those factors determining one's major could also be influential in any changes that occurred in the student's perceived affective values. Similarly, those students reporting a high involvement with the area of their off campus study, as measured by their present reading and correspondence habits, could be expected to rate their off-campus experiences quite positively.

More unusual were results from the item concerning the length of stay at the off-campus location. The most positive student-reported outcomes were from those who had studied off campus from 27 to 52 weeks. Interestingly, the second most positive time duration was that of 10 weeks or fewer. One might speculate that those students in the latter group were highly motivated and stayed so little time that the expected period of disillusionment never occurred. These two results would indicate that programs of one year's length and programs of 10 weeks or fewer (i.e., summer programs or one-month interim programs) are presently the best opportunities for positive affective change. By implication, those programs of one quarter or one semester might be too short to permit an optimistic upswing after a "down" period. As this project eventually plans to continue measurement several years after the student's return from the off-campus study, it will be extremely important to see if both time duration groups remain significant or if the "10 weeks or fewer" group proves to experience an immediate impact that quickly dissipates.

Concerning the tentative results apropos of the geographical location of the off-campus experience, one would hypothesize that such findings would likely emerge. Logically, experience in a culture more similar to the student's own should probably influence less change than experience in a culture radically different. Thus, students studying in Europe indicated fewer favorable responses than those staying in Central and South America, the Middle East, and Africa. This should also hold true on domestic programs in contrast to European or non-European programs. At most, such results would only indicate what *kinds* of outcomes may be expected in students choosing various geographical areas. Further, desired affective changes cannot be divorced from desired academic opportunities. The total impact of a program in Africa *should* differ from that of a program in Western Europe or New York City. Program directors and those administrators making policy decisions would surely profit in knowing the direction and intensity of affective changes that are likely to occur in specific programs.

Finally, the lack of systematic difference, to this point, based on the presence or absence of a host family or roommate is really not astounding after some consideration. Rather than the presence or absence of the two factors, the quality of the relationship between the American student and the host family or the roommate appears important. In the latter instance, there is a correlation between the quality of the relationship with the roommates and the major field of study of the individuals. Data from Phase II provided a more comprehensive understanding of these relationships.

Near the end of Phase I, in March, 1974, the Individual Opinion Inventory was revised by the members of the project team in light of what had been learned during the initial stages of the project. Specifi-

cally, Phase I Forms A, B and C were reviewed and then substantially altered. Most dramatically, the number of question items on Form A was reduced by approximately 50%.

For the continuation of the research during Phase II, beginning in March, 1974 and ending in March, 1976, pre and post forms for A and B were created, so that pre/post testing of students studying abroad or off campus within this country would be possible. The revised C form was designed for use with a baseline sample group of sophomore and junior undergraduates who remained on their home campuses throughout their undergraduate career. Careful attention was paid to this revision process before the instruments for Phase II were ready for distribution.

At the close of the second research phase, it is again appropriate to review and to revise the instruments. After reconsidering comments found on student questionnaires and occurring during student interviews, the authors believe that further alterations in the Individual Opinion Inventory are in order.

Footnotes: Chapter I

[1] Much of this section condenses pages 14-17 of the *Interim Report* (March, 1974).

[2] Otto Klineberg, *International Exchanges in Education, Science, and Culture: Suggestions for Research,* International Social Science Council (Paris: Mouton and Co., 1966), p. 11.

[3] In addition to the institutions of the Great Lakes Colleges Association and Regional Council for International Education, data were also collected at the University of California through the cooperation of William Allaway.

[4] See *Interim Report,* pp. 18-27.

[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 28-40.

Chapter II

SAMPLES AND DESIGN

All students arriving at and/or departing from program locations in Northern Europe, East and West Africa, and the Eastern and Western United States[1] were administered the appropriate form of the Individual Opinion Inventory between May, 1974 and September, 1975. Similarly all students arriving at and/or departing from sample institutions in the United States were administered the appropriate form of the IOI. From these, four groups were derived: students at the beginning of or immediately prior to an overseas sojourn (n=657 usable responses); students at the end of or immediately following an overseas sojourn (n=442 usable responses); students at the beginning of or immediately prior to a domestic sojourn (n=270 usable responses); and students at the end of or immediately following a domestic sojourn (n=257 usable responses).

As the technical requirements of a strict control group were an unrealistic goal in light of the present state of knowledge related to either overseas or domestic off-campus educational experiences, random baselines were drawn from sample institutions[2] in the United States approaching 20% of the sophomore/junior population. These baseline samples were drawn at three distinct times (May, 1974, November, 1974 and May, 1975), in order to approximate an average indication of opinions, attitudes and perceptions of sophomore and junior students over the duration of time when pre/post data were being collected related to sojourns (i.e., May, 1974 through September, 1975). This procedure resulted in a baseline sample of 630 usable responses. Items asked of these home students who had not participated in any off-campus programs during the period of study reflected identical items asked of students who were beginning or who had completed off-campus sojourns during the period. Where possible, items were set to match the post sojourn samples; i.e., post sojourn students were asked about their program experiences during the sojourn, while home students were also asked about their program experiences during the past year.

In short, by collecting the data over a duration of 16 months (between May, 1974 and September, 1975), it was hoped that the off-campus samples would include students from a diversity of programs who would have different expectations and opinions about their respective off-campus programs and sojourn experiences. Thus, the samples could be justified as being representative of a diversity of off-campus programs both abroad and in this country. Meanwhile the home campus sample data were collected at three distinct times (May, 1974, November, 1974 and May, 1975) in order to obtain an approximation of opinions, attitudes and perceptions of students remaining at their home campuses.

By comparing the two off-campus samples (both overseas and domestic) with this baseline sample group on the appropriate Inventory items, it was possible to assess the differences and similarities of the groups with respect to determining which interests and aspirations were attributable to the students' involvement in an off-campus program. The underlying assumption was that had the students in the off-campus samples remained on the home campus, they would have responded in similar ways to those who had remained on the home campus. Hence, on selected items, comparisons could be made among the samples from overseas programs, domestic programs and the home campuses.

As the sample groups were to be compared on an item-by-item basis, it was necessary to adjust for the possible multivariate characteristics that might have existed among the items. Using the Reduced Alpha Method,[3] the significance level was set at a point for the overall study that would be less than some pre-assigned value. Specifically, the Reduced Alpha Method uses the Bonferroni Inequality theorem.[4] This method was seen to be particularly appropriate because: (1) the comparisons in this study were specified *a priori;* (2) the Bonferroni Inequality theorem is valid for comparisons that are not orthogonal to each other; (3) while being very conservative, the method is particularly useful since it permits the assessment of differences between groups on an item-by-item basis; and (4) the method is especially powerful when concerned ". . . with detecting 'large' differences in population response proportions."[5] The comparisons made for each item and the respective types of tests of significance used are reported in the following chapters.

Since the data collection was spread over a 16-month period, data were obtained, as anticipated, both before and after the sojourn, for smaller samples of students on overseas and on domestic programs. Comparisons between groups of students drawn from the larger pre or post samples permitted further assessment of changes in opinions and/or attitudes occurring during the sojourn. The validity and generalizability of such comparisons, however, hinge on these smaller samples being representative of the larger samples. Using the statistics available from the larger samples (i.e., the means and standard deviations) as population values, z-tests and Chi-square tests were used to compare the smaller selected samples with the larger ones. The groups discussed in the following two paragraphs were accepted as valid reflections of the larger samples.

Within the above off-campus samples were two matched pair samples of students who completed both pre and post tests *overseas* (n=378 usable matched pairs) and students who completed both pre and post tests for *domestic* sojourns (n=181 usable matched pairs).[6] Various other samples could also be drawn from the data. For example, students overseas who reported studying a foreign language (n=142 usable responses) were compared to students overseas who did not study a foreign language (n=230 usable responses). Also, students studying a foreign language overseas who felt competent in speaking the foreign language at the beginning of the sojourn (n=24 usable responses) were compared to students studying the foreign language overseas who did not feel competent in speaking the language at the beginning of the sojourn (n=182 usable responses).[7]

During the sojourns themselves, two samples were randomly drawn at the five study locations: (1) social science majors, and (2) students from the total population. These students were systematically studied through semi-structured interviews during the sojourn – at the midpoint of the domestic programs and toward the end of the overseas sojourns. The results of this segment of the project are available elsewhere.[8]

A further word must be said about the sample, since results are always only as good as the populations from which the samplings are drawn. During the first phase of the present research (1970-1974), various professionals with substantial experience in off-campus education overseas were consulted concerning the overall study and the development of individual items for the IOI. There was complete agreement among those professionals consulted that an overseas sojourn did, without question, improve a student's language fluency and understanding if the selection procedures for the sojourn were any good at all. There was equal agreement that crucial questions concerned "value added" areas, where it had always been assumed that the students gained tremendously during the overseas sojourn because of the cultural exposure. It is that "value added" area – often referred to by those responsible for overseas education as "mutual respect," "mutual understanding," "increased tolerance," "respect for other ways and values," "bridges of understanding," etc. – that this present research has begun to investigate.

Pointedly, those same "value added" components are also claimed to be available to students during domestic sojourns, according to those with experience in off-campus domestic education. Hence the question arises, if similar results can be accomplished domestically and overseas, do the results accomplished by sojourn programs in the "value added" areas differ from what the students would have gained anyway at the home institution?

In order to look at these complex areas, however, one had to be as careful as possible not to bias the findings because of the particular programs chosen for the sample or because of the type of institutions selected for the home/baseline sample. Two consultants assisted with the selection of the overseas programs. They were asked to find a quality program for American undergraduate students in a non-Western (or Third World) country, as well as a quality program for American undergraduates in a Northern European country that would not attract language majors solely. These programs needed to be able to attract American undergraduates of various majors; hence no programs uniquely for architectural students or for translators were included. One large program was selected in Northern Europe and two smaller programs run by the same United States university were selected in East and West Africa. Not everyone would agree that the programs were the "best," or that the overseas programs so selected (or in fact the United States sample institutions or the domestic programs) completely represented all overseas programs – this was theoretically and practically impossible.

As independent researchers, not connected with any program, the authors were dependent upon the best professional judgments of the consultants. The authors did look carefully at the suggested programs and their ability to meet data collection procedures and saw no reason to question the suggestions of either of the consultants. The sample programs overseas, like sample programs domestically, seemed to have clear and careful selection procedures that attempted to filter out those applicants not motivated for serious study or others only seeking a holiday, but it was recognized that our present understanding of selection for off-campus education is far from perfect. Rather, it was the judgment of the consultants, accepted by the research team, that the selected overseas and domestic programs were good examples, which possessed appropriate staffs and adequate resources to provide the potential for an in-depth experience in the local culture. All programs granted collegiate credit to American undergraduate students from a wide variety and number of United States colleges and universities. But it must be remembered that, while the majority of the students for the study were from the selected programs, domestic and overseas, there were also students in the overseas and domestic samples from programs other than the programs selected for study. This was due to the fact that all students returning to and departing from any of the United States home institutions were also included in the analyses.

Having completed the present phase of this research, the research team has no reason to question the original suggestions of the consultants. The overseas programs did seem to be fair representatives of overseas programs not limited exclusively to language majors or other selected groups. There were no reasons located during the team's on-site visits during research to question the acceptability of the programs, overseas or domestic. In short, there is no reason, in the research team's professional opinion, to question the generalizability of the findings due to the programs selected for study.

Footnotes: Chapter II

[1] The choice of the five locations under study was based on results from Phase I of this research, which suggested, among other things, that students were more likely to perceive themselves as having changed during the study sojourn if they were at non-European overseas locations. Within Europe, however, students were most likely to have perceived themselves as having changed during the study sojourn if they were at a North European location. To feed the null hypothesis while looking at differences between European and non-European study sojourns, one program in Northern Europe was selected by two outside consultants, long experienced and widely respected in the field of American students studying overseas, as were two programs in Africa, both operated by the same U.S. institution. The two United States programs, one on the East and one on the West Coast, were chosen because of their reputations as good urban programs for undergraduates.

[2] Three U.S. institutions were originally part of this population for data collection: a major campus of a large Eastern state university system, a Midwestern private liberal arts college, and a campus of a major Western state university system with a reputation for innovation. The requirements for data collection proved unable to be met at the latter, and it was deleted midway in the data collection procedure.

[3] Douglas R. Whitney and Leonard S. Feldt. "Analyzing Questionnaire Results: Multiple Tests of Hypotheses and Multivariate Hypotheses." *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* XXXIII (1973), pp. 365-380.

[4] Richard J. Harris, *A Primer of Multivariate Statistics* (New York: Academic Press, 1975), p. 98.

[5] Whitney and Feldt, *op. cit.,* p. 397.

[6] The only significant difference between the matched paired groups and the larger samples was that the domestic program students in the matched pair sample were, upon departure, significantly more certain that their attitudes toward the political policies of the United States were not favorable than were those of the students in the larger samples. The average response for the matched pair group was 3.772, and for the large sample 3.589 (with a standard deviation of .956), on a five-point scale. The observed z-statistic is 2.561, p=.0104.

[7] Walter H. Lemke, Jr., W. Frank Hull IV, Richard T. Houang. "American Undergraduates Studying a Foreign Language During the Sojourns Abroad." This paper was presented to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, November 28, 1975, in Washington, D.C. Also, Walter H. Lemke, Jr., W. Frank Hull IV, and Richard T. Houang. "Foreign Language Training Prior to Study Abroad: A New Perspective." Pacific Northwest Council on Foreign Languages, *Proceedings* (Seattle, Washington, 1976), pp. 5-8.

[8] W. Frank Hull IV, Walter H. Lemke, Jr., Richard T. Houang. *Students in Sojourn: An Intensive Interview Study of American Undergraduates on Off-Campus Study Programs in the United States and Overseas,* October, 1975, and W. Frank Hull IV and Walter H. Lemke, Jr. *Case Studies of American Undergraduates on Off-Campus Programs, in the United States and Abroad,* March, 1976. Both were presented as Interim Reports to the Division of International Education, Office of Education. The former is available from The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Chapter III

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES

Data may always be considered in many ways. In the following sections, the results of the study are presented under various forms of analyses. In this section, the results of the study are listed by percentage response of the students to the instruments. Comparisons between all groups are considered in this section.

Demographic Characteristics

1. The median and mean age of all students in all groups was 20 to 21 years old; although the subjects ranged in age as follows: A-1, 18-63; A-2, 18-64; B-1, 18-24; B-2, 18-24; C, 18-54.

2. There were slightly fewer females in the home sample (56%) than in either the domestic sample (B-1, 62%; B-2, 67%) or in the overseas sample (A-1, 66%; A-2, 66%).

3. By major, a greater percentage of social science majors was in the domestic sample (72% pre and post) than in either the overseas sample (33% pre and 36% post) or the home sample (32%), although social science majors were the major group in all samples. Those overseas majored more often in the fine arts (A-2, 11%; B-2, 2%; C, 8%) and more often in languages (A-2, 4%; B-2, 0%; C, 1%).

4. The majority of students on off-campus programs in this study were on an 11- to 16-week (4-month) sojourn.

Pre Factors

5. Only a small proportion of the students in all samples had participated in a previous off-campus program (including high school programs). The proportions were relatively consistent between groups; i.e., those students indicating that they had not participated in any prior off-campus program were: A-1, 85%; A-2, 87%; B-1, 71%; B-2, 75%; C, 89%.

6. Almost half of the sojourn students had traveled to one or more foreign countries prior to their present sojourn, but a relatively small number of those overseas had ever been to the sojourn country (A-1, 17%; A-2, 11%). In group C, 28% had been abroad.

7. Most students had lived mainly in a suburban (rather than in a large city or rural) community. Fewer than 1% of the overseas students had lived mainly in the sojourn area, but 2-3% of the domestic students had.

8. Students indicated an increase in their reading of magazines and newspapers from or about the area of their off-campus program from before to after the sojourn, with the greatest increase being expressed by students on domestic programs. Students at the home campus showed little interest at

all in reading magazines and newspapers about the area of their campus, and most rated their reading as "mild to none."

9. Sojourn students in general indicated, before and after, that they had only studied the history and traditions "somewhat." There was indication, however, that study of the history and traditions of the area did increase during the sojourn. Home students were most likely to indicate that they had studied local history and tradition "not at all."

10. In terms of interest in the area, apart from any behavioral follow-through like reading or study, sojourn students rated their interest high both before and after – although overseas students showed a lessening of interest following the sojourn while domestic students remained the same. Students at home institutions generally expressed mild interest at most.

11. Most of the students in all samples felt their non-political attitudes (dress, life-style, social views, etc.) were not "conservative." If anything, students reported an even greater proportion of non-conservative attitudes following the sojourn rather than before. This was especially true among those students on a domestic sojourn. In general, sojourn students reflected the trend expressed on this factor by home students.

12. Only students on domestic sojourns (81%) either desired or had their desires fulfilled in terms of having their programs provide them with an opportunity for an in-depth study of local problems. In contrast, students abroad (36%) reported less opportunity to study local problems during their sojourn. A majority of the home campus students (77%) did not feel that their programs had provided them with the opportunity for an in-depth study of local problems.

13. Students going on sojourns generally did not anticipate that they would be studying and working harder at the sojourn location than they had at their home institution. Upon return, they clearly indicated that they had not found themselves studying and working harder during the sojourn. In contrast, however, it is to be noted that 62% of the home students indicated that they had studied harder during their college program the past year than they had previously.

	overseas pre*	domestic pre	overseas post*	domestic post	home
yes	35%	43%	13%	22%	62%
uncertain	25%	33%	6%	15%	6%
no	41%	24%	80%	63%	32%

*Total does not equal 100% due to rounding.

Sojourn Factors

14. A bare majority of the sojourn students lived with roommates, 51% overseas and 52% domestically. By contrast, 63% of the home students did have a roommate. In most cases the roommates were Americans (86% overseas; 96% domestically; 94% at home).

15. Overseas, 79% of the students had a host family arrangement, which in 98% of the cases was a non-American family.

16. Home students spent the least amount of time with those permanent residents who were local to the area of their institutions, with students overseas spending more time and domestic students spending the most time.

17. More students on sojourns informally dated and had interaction with members of the opposite sex who were native to the area than those at home institutions, but, while students on sojourns did seem to have such interaction, it was also clear that they went anticipating more such interaction than they experienced during the sojourn.

18. However, the majority of sojourn students did indicate that they did have the opportunity to relate to at least one member of the host culture and become vitally concerned with him or her (overseas, 65%; domestically, 77%; home, 38%), although again it was clear that students on sojourn had hoped for more such interaction before they went on the sojourn than they reported as occurring during the sojourn itself.

19. A majority of students in *all* samples indicated that they would like to work overseas for a few years and then return to the United States to live (A-1, 60%; A-2, 69%; B-1, 58%; B-2, 55%; C, 54%).

20. Even "given the right job opportunity," students were only slightly more willing to settle and work in the sojourn area following the sojourn rather than before. The highest group so willing were students on domestic sojourns, while only a slight majority of home students and students studying abroad expressed such a willingness.

21. But the majority of students in all samples did not wish to live permanently in the area of their program, with only those returning from domestic sojourns expressing any favorable feelings in that direction (37% saying "yes").

Sojourn Experience

22. While domestic and overseas students similarly anticipated that their sojourn experience would provide them with skills in understanding the complex nature of the political systems either at their home or among the local people (overseas, 63% and domestically, 70% expecting such), students were most likely to have felt this objective was realized during domestic experiences (A-2, 60%; B-2, 77%; C, 32%).

23. Students on domestic sojourns were the most likely to anticipate and to feel subsequently that the values and insights gained during the sojourn would and did motivate them to join associations which promote solutions to political and/or social problems (B-1, 51% and B-2, 55% so indicating "yes"). Overseas, students were generally negative about this (A-1, 43% and A-2, 50% indicating "no") or neutral (A-1, 23% and A-2, 26%), but most negative were home students (61% indicating "no").

24. Sojourn students widely anticipated that their experience off campus would force them to question their values (A-1, 74%; B-1, 79%) and widely reported that it did (A-2, 74%; B-2, 87%). However, it was also noted that 70% of the home students also indicated that their college program during the past year had also forced them to question their values.

25. Domestic students were solidly convinced (79%) that students who had been on an off-campus program did exhibit more social concern than those students who had remained at home, but those on overseas sojourns were less positive and home students were uncertain or negative.

Attitudes

26. Those students who had been on an overseas sojourn did tend to return from their sojourn expressing more favorable attitudes toward the political policies of the United States than prior to their sojourn (A-1, 17% and A-2, 21% indicating a favorable attitude toward the United States' political policies) with about the same proportion remaining undecided (A-1, 27%; A-2, 25%). Students on domestic sojourns became more negative (B-1, 59% and B-2, 78% responding negatively), while those at home indicated that their own attitudes toward the political policies of the United States had not become more favorable over the past year (75%). In general all student groups tended to express a lack of favorable attitudes toward the political policies of the United States.

27. While students prior to sojourns clearly saw themselves as consciously trying to analyze and accept others when they differed from them (A-1, 92%; B-1, 80%), they were less likely to feel that they still did so upon return (A-2, 58%; B-2, 57%) and expressed a more neutral or undecided position (A-2, 34%; B-2, 38%; up from an A-1, 6%; B-1, 6% "neutral position"). Home students most closely

resembled the pre-sojourn views in feeling that they did consciously try to analyze and accept others when they differed from them (C: "yes," 76%; "neutral," 8%; "no," 16%).

28. Students departing for foreign sojourns did feel confident of their own personal opinions and judgments but returned from overseas feeling less confident, while domestic students returned more confident, bringing these domestic returnees to about the same level of proportionate feelings as those in the home sample.

	overseas pre	domestic pre*	overseas post*	domestic post	home
yes	84%	73%	75%	80%	82%
uncertain	9%	12%	14%	12%	8%
no	7%	16%	12%	8%	10%

*Total does not equal 100% due to rounding.

29. Students as a group were most likely to feel that they could distinguish differences between values at home and among the local people at the end of the sojourn rather than before, but a high percentage did feel they could do this prior to the sojourns (A-1, 75%; B-1, 70%).

30. On the other hand, the majority of the sojourn students felt that they could fairly characterize the "local people" of the area only following the sojourn (A-2, 67% and B-2, 68%, compared to A-1, 23% and B-1, 39% prior to the sojourn). For Group C, the comparable percentage was 45%.

31. Students on overseas sojourns were the most likely of any group to have had a roommate who was of a distinctly different religion (30% did, as compared to 16% on domestic sojourns and 28% at home); however, a high percentage of students indicated that neither the roommate nor the students had any particular religion (overseas, 42%; domestic, 59%; home, 53%).

32. Remembering that most of the roommates were Americans: (1) students on sojourns were most likely to report that their roommate "seemed interested in me and my welfare – very helpful and/or warm relationship" (overseas, 76%; domestic, 81%; home, 68%); (2) students on sojourns were most likely to report that their roommate "treated me as a brother (sister) and included me in all his (her) activities when possible" (overseas, 56%; domestic, 60%; home, 50%); (3) students on sojourns reported that they felt their relationship with the roommate to have made them feel "very open to discuss personal problems" (overseas, 71%; domestic, 70%; home, 58%). On the whole, relationships were closest and most satisfactory for the students on sojourns rather than for those at home, but those on domestic sojourns were the most positive overall.

33. Students generally did feel that their experience in living with their particular roommate had made them "more tolerant or accepting of others," regardless of the location of the sojourn or whether they had remained at home (overseas, 76%; domestic, 84%; home, 80%).

Consequences

34. Students on sojourns were more likely to feel that their experience during the sojourn had helped them "gain a better understanding of [their] own home culture," than those who had remained in programs at home (overseas, 84%; domestic, 80%; home, 53% positive responses), but it is to be noted that there was little difference on this item between those overseas and those on domestic sojourns.

35. Students on domestic sojourns were the most certain that they had had an "opportunity to view class differences" during their experience (domestic, 98%). Students on overseas sojourns were more negative in reporting such an opportunity and, in fact, somewhat mirrored the response of those who had remained at a home institution (overseas, 75% positive, 8% undecided, 18% negative; home, 72% positive, 9% undecided, 18% negative). In a similar fashion, students on domestic sojourns felt that they

had had "the opportunity to view the way people behave because of class differences" (97% saying "yes"), while those at home were less sure that they had (68% said "yes") and those returning from overseas sojourns were the least sure (58% said "yes" while 26% said "no" – the highest "no" response to the item).

36. Students were equally divided in regard to becoming "less materialistic," with only a third in each sample saying "yes."

37. Students in all samples felt that their experience had made them "a more tolerant individual" regardless of their group. However, the highest positive response was from those returning from domestic sojourns (79%), followed by those who had remained at home (77%) and then those who had been on overseas sojourns (73%).

Similarly those on domestic sojourns returned feeling that their experience had made them more "tolerant of other people" (75% saying "yes"), followed by those who had remained at home (73% saying "yes") and then those who had been on an overseas sojourn (66% saying "yes"). Again, students returning from domestic sojourns were most likely to report that their experience had made them "more tolerant of other cultures' attitudes and views" (81% saying "yes"). In this case, however, those students returning from overseas sojourns followed closely (80% saying "yes"), with 70% of the home students so reporting.

38. Sojourn students were more likely to report that their experience had helped them "gain a better understanding of their own home culture" than those who had remained at home (overseas, 84%; domestic, 80%; home, 53%).

39. Students returning from domestic sojourns were most likely to feel that their experience had given them a feeling that they were "better prepared to cope with the 'real world' beyond college" (domestic, 94% saying "yes"). Students returning from overseas programs and those who had remained at home were less certain (overseas, 65% saying "yes"; home, 61% saying "yes").

40. Students returning from domestic sojourns were the most likely to feel that "because of their program" their "vocational plans are more clear" (75% saying "yes"). Students remaining at home also so reported (67% saying "yes"), but those students returning from overseas sojourns had a majority response of "no" (overseas, 33% "yes," 13% uncertain or unsure, 54% "no").

41. Students returning from domestic programs were the most likely to feel that "college social activities were less important to them" (domestic, 59% "yes"). Students remaining at home followed (41% "yes"), while those students returning from overseas programs were strong in indicating that college social activities were important to them upon return (overseas, 30% "yes," 17% "uncertain," 53% "no"). Again the majority of those returning from overseas sojourns disagreed with the other two groups.

42. Students who had remained at home were the only ones who clearly felt that their program had been a "definite factor in their interest in remaining in college" (66% "yes"). Students returning from domestic sojourns and those returning from overseas sojourns indicated that their program had not been such a factor (domestic, 40% "yes," 16% "uncertain," 44% "no"; overseas, 24% "yes," 15% "uncertain," 60% "no"). Among the returning sojourn students, those returning from domestic sojourns were more likely to indicate that their program was a factor in their remaining in college than were those returning from overseas programs.

Students' Overall Evaluation

43. While the majority of all three groups of students were positive in their recommendation to other students to participate in their program, students who had returned from domestic sojourns were the most positive in their recommendations (94% saying "yes"), followed by those who had been on an overseas program (75% saying "yes"), followed by those who had remained at home (53% saying "yes").

44. Most students rated their "overall experience" positively, but those returning from domestic programs were the most favorable (96% saying "yes"), followed by those who had been on overseas programs (89% saying "yes") and those who had remained at home (72% saying "yes").

45. Majorities of students returning from a sojourn rated their program as "the best part of their undergraduate experience." Students returning from domestic sojourns were likely to be more positive about their rating than those returning from overseas sojourns (domestic, 74% "yes"; overseas, 65% "yes"; home, 41% "yes").

46. Overall, students on sojourns generally anticipated that their program would be such a valuable part of their education that they would go to college four and a half years instead of four years in order to fit it in (A-1, 79%; B-1, 63% saying "yes"), although about a quarter of students on domestic programs were unsure of their feelings (B-1, 24% indicating "neutral or uncertain") prior to the sojourn. Following the sojourn, most students overseas and domestically were convinced that the sojourn was of such value to them (A-2, 76%; B-2, 69%). But half of the home students saw their past year's program to be of such value that they, too, would go four and a half years instead of four years in order to fit it in (C, 50%), but a higher proportion of home students were clearly negative (C, 32%, as compared to A-2, 11%; and B-2, 11%).

Chapter IV

RESPONSES PRIOR TO THE SOJOURN

In analyzing the data exhibited on comparable items responded to by students *prior* to a sojourn overseas or in the United States, as well as by those sophomore and junior students selected randomly who remained on their home campus, the following statistically significant differences appeared at the .001 level.[1] Intriguing, statistically non-significant items are also included and identified as such. The statistics for the following paragraphs (numbered 1-24) appear in Table I.

Comparisons of Background Variables

1. In contrast to the home campus students, there were more overseas program students majoring in the humanities, fine arts and education. At the same time, there were fewer students overseas majoring in the natural sciences and physical education. The domestic program students were most likely to major in the social sciences. None of these latter students majored in physical education.

2. The majority of the overseas program students and the domestic program students (58% and 60% respectively) came from suburban areas of residence. Significantly more home campus students came from small towns.

3. Both overseas program students (53%) and domestic program students (49%) indicated that they had previously traveled to one or more foreign countries, while the majority of the home campus students had traveled extensively, but not outside the boundaries of the United States or Canada (46%).

4. Although a majority of all three groups of students indicated that they had not participated in a previous off-campus program, there were significantly more domestic program students (29%) who indicated that they had participated in prior off-campus programs than did students in the other two groups (A-1, 15%; C, 11%).

5. Both overseas program students (88%) and domestic program students (99%) indicated that they attended concerts and local cultural events more frequently than did home campus students (75%).

Comparisons of students' expectations and interests in the area of their studies

6. There was more interest in the area of the study location, as well as prior study of its history and traditions, among students on overseas and domestic programs than among those remaining on the home campus. On each item, significant differences emerged between the three groups. Each group rated its reading of newspapers, magazines, etc., from and about the local area as "mild," however.

7. Before the sojourn began, students on domestic and overseas programs felt that they could distinguish differences between the values of the people of their own home area and those values of the people residing in the area where they were to study. Students at a home campus did not. Overseas students did not feel that they could fairly characterize the local people of the sojourn area.

Domestic program students and home campus students felt more capable of characterizing the local people fairly.

8. Students who remained on their home campus were least certain about eventually settling in the local area, even given the "right job opportunity." Program students overseas were slightly positive on this item; domestic program students were significantly more positive tha.. the home campus students. All three groups of students were neutral – with the home campus students significantly more negative than the other two groups, about the possibility of living permanently in the area of their off-campus experience.

Comparisons of students' expectations regarding their off-campus programs and experience

9. Both students on overseas and on domestic programs expected that the experience off campus would force them to question their values.

10. Students on domestic programs expected their programs to provide the opportunity for in-depth study of local problems; overseas program students did so also, but to a lesser degree. Home campus students answered rather negatively on this item. All three groups differed significantly from one another.

11. Both off-campus groups expected the experience to provide them with skills in understanding the complex nature of the political system of the sojourn area or their own home area.

12. Domestic program students had very positive expectations that they would become more conscious of urban people and urban problems during their off-campus programs. Overseas program students had significantly less positive expectations on this item.

13. Overseas program students were the most positive group in feeling that formal study – as part of their off-campus program – should be given to understanding the social class structure and family organization among the local people. The home campus students were significantly more neutral than the other two groups, followed by domestic program students who also agreed but not as strongly. Domestic program students were most convinced that their programs should be oriented towards alleviating poverty and social/political problems at the study location. Students on the home campuses tended to be neutral or uncertain, while students overseas disagreed that there should be such an orientation. All three groups differed significantly among themselves.

14. Domestic program students expected their programs to provide them with experiences directly related to their intended careers. Significantly fewer overseas and home campus students, however, had such expectations.

15. In contrast to the domestic program students, the overseas program students were not certain in expecting that they would be working or studying harder during their off-campus program than they would have worked or studied at their home institution.

Comparisons of students' expectations of themselves

16. Overseas program students expected to be able to date informally and to have interactions with those of the opposite sex from the sojourn area; domestic students agreed, but not as strongly. Home campus students were neutral or uncertain on this question. All three groups differed significantly on this item. Further, both overseas and domestic program students expected to have the opportunity to relate to at least one member of the host culture and to become vitally concerned with him or her.

17. Both overseas program students and domestic program students were positive in stating that one of the major reasons why they had signed up for their program was the desire to relate to people intensively.

Comparisons of students' views of themselves and some students' selected opinions

18. While both overseas program students and domestic program students expected their programs to be such a valuable part of their undergraduate programs that they would be willing to continue four and a half years instead of four in order to fit the off-campus experience into their schedules, overseas program students would be more willing to do so.

19. While all groups of students saw their non political attitudes (dress, life style, social activities, etc.) as not conservative, overseas program students were significantly the least conservative group.

20. Domestic students indicated that they felt motivated to join associations which promote solutions to political and/or social problems. Overseas program students and home campus students were uncertain on this item. All three groups differed among themselves significantly.

21. Both domestic and overseas program students felt that they did consciously try to analyze and to accept others who differed from them. Home students also replied positively but statistically less so than the other two groups.

22. Both home campus and overseas program students were statistically more positive concerning confidence in their personal opinions and judgments than were domestic program students.

23. Overseas program students, then domestic program students, were interested in working abroad for a few years and then returning to the United States to live. Those students on the home campuses were significantly less certain than the overseas students on this item.

24. Overseas and domestic program students answered similarly about their attitudes toward the political policies of the United States – their responses being in the neutral or negative area.

Summary

Students responsing *prior* to their formal off-campus program seemed to characterize themselves in the following ways. Students going off campus on programs did have an existing interest in the area and in the local people of the sojourn location. These students desired to relate to individuals from the program study area. Those students going overseas seemed to be motivated primarily for personal reasons of getting to know another people or culture. Students on domestic programs expected that their off-campus program should be actively involved in activities for the benefit of the local community. Furthermore, all students believed that their off-campus program should prove important in their career preparations. Overall, students going abroad or participating in off-campus programs in this country expected their personal values to be questioned.

TABLE I

Statistics for Comparisons of Responses Prior to the Sojourn

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description "m"= Means "s"= Standard Deviations "n"= Number of students who responded.		Column 1 Overseas Program Students Form A-1	Column 2 Domestic Program Students Form B-1	Column 3 Home Campus Students Form C-1	Comparisons Col.1 vs Col.2	Comparisons Col.1 vs Col.3	Comparisons Col.2 vs Col.3
1	Major	m	--	--	--			
		s	--	--	--			
		n	(641)	(260)	(616)	*	*	*
2	Prior residence	m	--	--	--			
		s	--	--	--			
		n	(629)	(258)	(610)	ns	*	*
3	Prior travel	m	--	--	--			
		s	--	--	--			
		n	(649)	(269)	(625)	ns	*	*
4	Prior off-campus program	m	--	--	--			
		s	--	--	--			
		n	(655)	(269)	(626)	*	ns	*
5	Attendance at concerts or local cultural events	m	--	--	--			
		s	--	--	--			
		n	(644)	(269)	(630)	ns	*	*
6	Interest in sojourn area	m	1.597	1.962	3.056			
		s	0.691	0.799	0.876	*	*	*
		n	(652)	(266)	(629)			
6	Study of history or traditions of sojourn area	m	3.075	3.416	4.006			
		s	0.978	0.901	1.041	*	*	*
		n	(656)	(267)	(627)			
6	Reading of materials from or about the sojourn area	m	3.361	3.216	3.231			
		s	1.017	1.073	0.908	ns	ns	ns
		n	(645)	(269)	(628)			
7	Value differences between home and sojourn people	m	2.135	2.232	2.924			
		s	0.890	0.982	1.145	ns	*	*
		n	(654)	(267)	(622)			
7	Ability to fairly characterize sojourn people	m	3.168	2.909	2.804			
		s	0.868	0.894	0.959	*	*	ns
			(638)	(265)	(627)			

-- = not applicable (see footnote 2)
* = statistically significant (see footnote 1)
ns = statistically not significant (see footnote 1)

TABLE I (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-1	Column 2 Domestic Form B-1	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
8	Willing to settle in sojourn area	m s n	2.498 0.901 (651)	2.341 0.908 (267)	2.652 1.202 (627)	ns	ns	*
8	Willing to live permanently in sojourn area	m s n	3.100 0.702 (647)	3.116 0.855 (267)	3.396 1.047 (626)	ns	*	*
9	Expect sojourn experiences to force you to question values	m s n	2.177 0.927 (655)	2.015 0.883 (269)		ns		
10	In-depth study of sojourn area problems	m s n	2.677 0.934 (654)	2.149 0.782 (268)	3.789 0.819 (626)	*	*	*
11	Skills in understanding political systems	m s n	2.424 0.921 (656)	2.243 0.925 (268)		ns		
12	Conscious of urban people and urban problems	m s n	2.415 0.877 (650)	1.581 0.590 (267)		*		
13	Formal study of class or family organization	m s n	2.417 0.975 (648)	2.644 1.012 (267)	3.077 (0.991) (627)	ns	*	*
13	Program to alleviate poverty problems at sojourn location	m s n	3.558 0.869 (645)	2.758 0.997 (264)	3.160 0.966 (626)	*	*	*
14	Career related experiences	m s n	2.271 1.088 (657)	1.732 0.758 (269)	2.373 1.062 (620)	*	ns	*
15	Amount of studying during program	m s n	3.020 1.103 (655)	2.696 1.027 (263)		*		
16	Dating or interaction with people native to location	m s n	1.847 0.837 (655)	2.341 0.874 (267)	3.287 1.203 (616)	*	*	*
16	Relate to at least one native and become vitally concerned	m s n	1.948 0.789 (650)	1.880 0.755 (267)		ns		

TABLE I (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-1	Column 2 Domestic Form B-1	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
17	Desire to relate to people intensively	m s n	2.524 1.048 (651)	2.397 1.042 (267)		ns		
18	Program valuable enough to extend college to 4 1/2 years	m s n	1.919 0.946 (653)	2.316 0.941 (269)		*		
19	Non-political attitudes	m s n	3.512 1.045 (651)	3.190 1.103 (269)	3.236 1.129 (627)	*	*	ns
20	Join associations promoting solutions to political and social problems	m s n	3.056 1.031 (655)	2.700 0.987 (267)	3.309 1.061 (627)	*	*	*
21	Consciously try to analyze and accept others who differ	m s n	1.804 0.633 (652)	1.947 0.642 (265)	2.242 0.947 (625)	ns	*	*
22	Confident of personal opinions and judgments	m s n	1.994 0.803 (655)	2.297 0.929 (266)	2.069 0.855 (627)	*	ns	*
23	Work overseas for a few years	m s n	2.292 0.882 (655)	2.401 1.010 (267)	2.556 1.100 (629)	ns	*	ns
24	Attitude toward the political policies of the United States	m s n	3.529 0.970 (648)	3.589 0.956 (265)		ns		

Footnotes: Chapter IV

[1]Statistical comparisons between the groups are made using t-tests or X^2-tests, where appropriate. Since comparisons are made over a number of items, the Reduced Alpha Method (see Chapter II) is used to control the Type I errors for each item and the overall Type I error. That is, for each item, the significant level for each comparison is set at .001/3 so that the overall significant level is – at most – .05. In Table I of this chapter, significant differences between the groups are indicated by asterisks (*), whereas non-significant differences are indicated by "ns".

[2]Means (m) and standard deviations (s) are calculated using the values ranging from a "1" for a positive (or "strong yes") response to a "5" for a negative (or "strong no") response. These calculations are based only on those students who responded to the individual items. In this table, the mean response (m), the standard deviation (s) and the number of respondents (n) are reported for each item. For items that have categorical response choices, means and standard deviations are not applicable and are consequently left blank.

Chapter V

RESPONSES FOLLOWING THE SOJOURN

In analyzing the data exhibited on comparable items responded to by students *following* a sojourn overseas or in this country, as well as by those sophomore and junior students selected randomly on their home campus, the following statistically significant differences appeared at the .001 level.[1] Intriguing, statistically non-significant items are also included and identified as such. The statistics for the following paragraphs (numbered 1-30) appear in Table II.

Comparisons of Background Variables

1. Results of comparisons between the major fields of study for the three student groups reflected the results of similar comparisons conducted prior to the sojourn experience. For example, more students overseas majored in the humanities, languages, the fine arts and education than did those students who remained on their home campus. Again, there were fewer overseas students majoring in the natural and physical sciences than among the home campus students. Domestic program students were most likely to major in the social sciences (72%), in contrast to 37% of the students overseas and 32% of the home campus students. There were also more domestic program students majoring in the humanities but none majoring in languages or physical education, in comparison to those on the home campus and overseas.

2. Although the majority of all three student groups indicated that they came from suburban areas, there were significantly more students in the overseas programs than in the home campus group who grew up in the suburbs.

3. Overseas and domestic program students traveled more extensively than did home campus students. Fifty-one percent of the overseas program students and 47% of the domestic program students indicated that they had been to one or more foreign countries, excluding Canada, as contrasted to 28% of the home campus students.

4. Twenty-five percent of the domestic program students reported having previously participated in an off-campus program, while only 13% of the overseas program students and 11% of the home campus students had done so.

5. Both overseas program students and domestic program students indicated that they attended concerts and cultural events more frequently than did home campus students. Ninety-eight percent of the domestic program students so indicated, whereas 25% of the home campus students reported that they did not attend any concerts or local cultural events during the past academic year. The overseas program students were between the other two groups on this item.

6. On the roommate item, several interesting facts emerged. First, only 14% of those overseas lived with a host family without a roommate. For comparative reasons, this 14% may be weighted into the "no roommate" category. A majority of the domestic program students (55%) and the home campus students (63%) reported having lived with one roommate, in contrast to 42% for the overseas program

students. In the "no roommate" category, the figures were as follows: 11% for the domestic program students; 15% for the home campus students; and 48% for the overseas group. Further, domestic program students tended to have more than one roommate (34%) much more frequently than either of the other groups. Finally, those on the home campus tended to be married (8%) much more often than the students in the other two groups (about 1% in each).

Comparisons of students' expectations and interests in the area of their sojourn

7. Overseas program students and domestic program students were indistinguishable in their opinions that their programs had indeed provided them with the formal opportunity of studying the history and traditions of the local people and area, and that they had also studied these same subjects on their own in some detail. Home campus students had not done much studying of these topics formally or on their own.

8. Domestic program students had the highest level of reading magazines, newspapers, etc., from or about the area of their study. Overseas program students reported reading less, while home campus students reported little reading of materials about the local area surrounding or incorporating their campus. Both overseas program students and domestic program students reported a high degree of interest in the area, while the home campus students were neutral.

9. Overseas program students and domestic program students were indistinguishable in feeling that they could fairly characterize the local people and in believing that they could see errors in the way the local people perceived local and international issues. Home campus students were significantly different on these items (i.e., clearly neutral). Overseas program students, however, differed from domestic program students in that they felt more certain about being able to distinguish differences between the values of their home locations and those of the sojourn area. Again, home campus students were neutral in comparison.

10. Domestic program students were significantly more positive about the idea of settling and working in the local area, given the right job opportunity, or of living there permanently. Overseas program students and home campus students were indistinguishable and just slightly more positive than neutral to working in the area or living there permanently.

11. Both overseas and domestic program students reported having spent significantly more time alone with individuals who were not part of their college group and who were permanent (i.e., native) members of the local community than did home campus students.

Comparisons of students' expectations of their programs and experiences

12. Although overseas and domestic program students and home campus students all felt that they had had the opportunity to view class differences and the ways people behave as a result of class differences, home campus students and overseas program students were not statistically distinguishable. Domestic program students, however, felt that they had greater opportunity in both cases and differed significantly from the other two groups.

13. Overseas program students and domestic program students were not statistically different, but both groups indicated that they had observed differences in family structure between the local people and those from their own home culture. Home campus students were uncertain on this variable.

14. Domestic program students felt that their program had provided them with the opportunity for an in-depth study of local problems, while overseas students were uncertain on this variable, and home campus students did not believe that they had been provided with such an opportunity.

15. Domestic program students were the most certain that their programs had provided them with skills in understanding the complex nature of political systems either at home or in the sojourn area. Overseas program students were less sure, and home campus students were uncertain.

16. Domestic program students were the most certain that a meaningful part of their off-campus experience was participation with the local people in some social work or community activity. Overseas program students were indistinguishable from home campus students on this variable. The latter two groups were both negative.

17. Home campus students felt that they had studied harder during the last academic year than they had previously. In contrast, the overseas program students felt certain that they had not studied harder than they had at their home institution and the domestic program students, though less certain, also felt the same.

18. In regard to clarification of vocational plans achieved during the academic year, the domestic program students answered most positively; home campus students gave a qualified "yes," while overseas program students were uncertain. Similarly, domestic program students felt that their off-campus programs had provided them with experiences directly related to their intended careers, as did home campus students. Again, overseas program students were less certain.

19. Home campus students were the most positive in indicating that their program had been a definite factor in their interest in remaining in college. Domestic program students agreed somewhat, while overseas program students were uncertain.

Comparisons of students' expectations of themselves

20. Overseas program students and domestic program students agreed in identifying their own non-political attitudes (e.g., dress, life style, etc.) as not conservative. Home campus students were less certain on this variable, differing significantly from overseas program students.

21. Domestic program students felt that the values and insights gained during their off-campus experience now motivated them to join associations which promote solutions to political and/or social problems. Overseas program students and home campus students were uncertain.

23. While all groups of students believed that their experiences had forced them to question their own values, home campus students and overseas program students were not statistically distinguishable from one another. Domestic program students, however, were significantly more certain that this had happened.

24. All student groups indicated that they were confident of their own personal opinions and judgments.

25. All student groups felt that their experiences had caused them to feel better prepared to cope with the "real world" beyond college. Domestic program students, however, were most confident of this judgment, followed by overseas program students and then by home campus students. Each group differed significantly from the others.

26. While not statistically different, overseas program students and domestic program students felt that they had been able to have informal interaction and dating with those of the opposite sex local to the area. Home program students were polarized, replying either "yes" or "no." Differing significantly from one another on the variable of having the opportunity to relate with at least one member of the host culture and to become vitally concerned with him or her, the domestic program students answered most positively, followed by the overseas program students, who were almost in the neutral category in their aggregate response.

27. All three groups felt that their experiences had made them more tolerant individuals and were indistinguishable, statistically. Similarly, all groups felt that they had become more tolerant of other people because of their experiences. However, overseas and domestic program students, while indistinguishable from one another, were more likely than home campus students to feel that they had become more tolerant of other cultures' attitudes and views. Yet home campus students were most

prone to report that they did consciously try to analyze and accept others different from themselves than were either the overseas or the domestic program students. The latter two groups answered affirmatively and were thus indistinguishable from each other. The only significant differences were found between home campus students and overseas program students.

Comparisons of students' views of themselves and some students' selected opinions

28. All three groups of students were positive in their assessment of their relationships with their roommates in terms of the roommates' interest in them and their welfare, inclusion in activities, and freedom to discuss personal topics and problems. On each variable, the domestic program students and the home campus student groups were statistically different, the domestic program students more positive on each variable. All three groups agreed that their experience in living with a roommate(s) had made them more tolerant and accepting of others.

29. Overseas program students were significantly different from the other two student groups in expressing that they were less certain that their attitudes toward the political policies of the United States following their off-campus experience were not more favorable than before. The other two groups were more certain that their attitudes were less favorable than before.

30. All groups were positive in their recommendation that other students should participate in their programs, but they differed significantly in their degrees of positive recommendation. The domestic program students were the most positive, then the overseas program students, followed by the home campus students. The same pattern emerged in the three groups' overall rating of their experience as being favorable. Overseas program students and domestic program students, both answering positively, were indistinguishable in their agreement that their programs had been the best part of their undergraduate experience and of such value to them that they would go to college four and a half years, if necessary, in order to fit the off-campus experience into their schedules. Home program students were uncertain but slightly positive on the latter variable.

Summary

In summary, certain attitudinal changes in undergraduates seem to occur during any academic year. Living with a roommate, for example, seems to foster a quality of tolerance for others, whether the student is off campus or on campus. Conversely, the off-campus experience does tend to increase knowledge about the study area, as well as awareness of the sojourn location's people and culture. The latter led "naturally" to increased interaction with those local to the sojourn areas and to more tolerant feelings toward others.

Domestic program students became the most involved with the off-campus community and grew most aware of political, social and cultural differences. These students clarified their vocational plans more than did those of the other two groups. In addition, these students tended to end their off-campus experiences more likely to join associations and organizations which promote solutions to political and/or social concerns. Of the three groups, the domestic program students were most forced to question their values and to re-examine their standards.

All three groups recommended their programs, often with reservations and qualifications. The domestic program students were the most positive group in affirming their experience and in recommending it to others.

TABLE II

Statistics for Comparisons of Responses Following the Sojourn

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description "m" = Means [2] "s" = Standard Deviations "n" = Number of students who responded		Column 1 Overseas Program Students Form A-2	Column 2 Domestic Program Students Form B-2	Column 3 Home Campus Students Form C-1	Comparisons Col.1 vs Col.2	Comparisons Col.2 vs Col.3	Comparisons Col.3 vs Col.3
1	Major	m s n	-- -- (435)	-- -- (252)	-- -- (616)	*	*	*
2	Prior residence	m s n	-- -- (433)	-- -- (250)	-- -- (610)	ns	*	ns
3	Prior travel	m s n	-- -- (442)	-- -- (256)	-- -- (625)	ns	*	*
4	Prior off-campus program(s)	m s n	-- -- (442)	-- -- (257)	-- -- (626)	*	ns	*
5	Attendance at concerts or other local cultural events	m s n	-- -- (440)	-- -- (257)	-- -- (630)	*	*	*
6	Roommate(s)	m s n	-- -- (438)	-- -- (257)	-- -- (628)	*	*	*
6	Roommate nationality	m s n	-- -- (193)	-- -- (229)	-- -- (482)	ns	*	ns
7	Formal study of history and/or traditions of sojourn area	m s n	2.621 1.001 (433)	2.701 1.112 (251)	4.086 0.980 (619)	ns	*	*
7	Informal study of history and/or traditions of sojourn area	m s n	2.834 0.822 (439)	2.964 0.984 (253)	4.006 1.041 (627)	ns	*	*
8	Reading of materials from or about sojourn area	m s n	3.014 1.026 (420)	2.419 0.884 (253)	3.231 0.808 (628)	*	*	*

-- = Not applicable (see footnote 2)

* = Statistically significant (see footnote 1)

ns = Not Statistically significant (see footnote 1)

36

TABLE II (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-2	Column 2 Domestic Form B-2	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
8	Interest in sojourn area	m s n	1.961 0.835 (434)	2.008 0.834 (256)	3.056 0.876 (629)	ns	*	*
9	Ability to fairly characterize sojourn people	m s n	2.398 0.723 (432)	2.399 0.812 (253)	2.804 0.959 (627)	ns	*	*
9	Errors in perception of sojourn people	m s n	2.606 0.949 (432)	2.474 0.898 (251)	2.816 0.862 (624)	ns	*	*
9	Value differences between home and sojourn people	m s n	1.684 0.776 (440)	1.972 1.021 (254)	2.924 1.145 (622)	*	*	*
10	Willingness to settle in sojourn area	m s n	2.505 1.106 (442)	2.094 1.049 (256)	2.652 1.202 (627)	*	ns	*
10	Willingness to live permanently in sojourn area	m s n	3.395 0.937 (441)	2.941 1.099 (255)	3.396 1.047 (626)	*	ns	*
10	Desire to work overseas for a few years	m s n	2.184 0.938 (441)	2.431 0.972 (246)	2.556 1.100 (629)	ns	*	ns
11	Time alone with natives	m s n	2.151 1.196 (438)	2.444 1.209 (252)	1.515 1.056 (627)	ns	*	*
11	Language/ time alone with natives	m s n	2.773 1.099 (436)	2.838 1.049 (253)	3.713 0.928 (624)	ns	*	*
12	Class differences	m s n	2.298 0.969 (439)	1.488 0.579 (256)	2.356 0.958 (624)	*	ns	*
12	Class differences and behavior	m s n	2.588 1.044 (434)	1.576 0.574 (257)	2.402 0.992 (627)	*	ns	*

TABLE II (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-2	Column 2 Domestic Form B-2	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
13	Differences in family structure	m s n	2.320 1.019 (438)	2.315 1.117 (254)	3.420 1.030 (621)	ns	*	*
14	In-depth study of sojourn area problems	m s n	3.098 1.033 (441)	2.031 0.895 (257)	3.789 0.819 (626)	*	*	*
15	Skills in understanding political systems	m s n	2.592 1.059 (441)	2.117 0.945 (256)	3.269 1.074 (625)	*	*	*
16	Social work or participation in community activity	m s n	3.616 1.041 (437)	2.117 1.188 (257)	3.791 1.025 (626)	*	ns	*
17	Amount of studying during program	m s n	4.070 1.005 (440)	3.480 1.149 (254)	2.562 1.225 (625)	*	*	*
18	Clarification of vocational plans	m s n	3.217 1.085 (437)	2.173 1.041 (255)	2.489 1.105 (626)	*	*	*
18	Career-related experiences	m s n	2.626 1.185 (441)	1.728 0.809 (254)	2.373 1.062 (620)	*	*	*
19	Remaining in college	m s n	3.414 1.116 (437)	2.984 1.186 (253)	2.452 1.169 (624)	*	*	*
20	Non-political attitudes	m s n	3.534 1.050 (440)	3.439 1.068 (255)	3.236 1.129 (627)	ns	*	ns
21	Join associations promoting solutions to political/social problems	m s n	3.371 0.895 (423)	2.648 1.058 (256)	3.309 1.061 (627)	*	ns	*
21	Off-campus students/social concern	m s n	2.632 0.946 (429)	1.965 0.831 (256)	2.936 0.936 (627)	*	*	*

TABLE II (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-2	Column 2 Domestic Form B-2	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
22	Home culture understanding	m s n	1.914 0.832 (440)	1.972 0.867 (251)	2.717 1.080 (619)	ns	*	*
23	Sojourn experience cause student to question values	m s n	2.244 1.055 (439)	1.757 0.901 (255)	2.372 1.110 (623)	*	ns	*
24	Confident of personal opinion and judgments	m s n	2.107 0.825 (441)	2.129 0.764 (255)	2.069 0.855 (627)	ns	ns	ns
25	Ability to cope with "real world"	m s n	2.331 0.923 (432)	1.626 1.686 (254)	2.551 1.061 (619)	*	*	*
26	Dating and interaction with natives	m s n	2.692 1.229 (439)	2.913 1.210 (254)	3.287 1.203 (616)	ns	*	*
26	Opportunity to relate to at least one native and become vitally concerned	m s n	2.483 1.161 (439)	2.160 1.035 (256)	3.220 1.203 (627)	*	*	*
27	More tolerant individual	m s n	2.153 0.849 (439)	2.145 0.849 (255)	2.152 0.964 (627)	ns	ns	ns
27	More tolerant of others	m s n	2.307 0.888 (437)	2.213 0.871 (254)	2.252 0.996 (627)	ns	ns	ns
27	More tolerant of other cultures	m s n	2.041 0.815 (435)	2.073 0.844 (248)	2.337 0.988 (624)	ns	*	*
27	Consciously try to analyze and accept	m s n	2.464 0.790 (293)	2.346 0.796 (211)	2.242 0.947 (625)	ns	*	ns
28	Roommate relationship: interest	m s n	1.309 0.617 (191)	1.227 0.514 (225)	1.447 0.780 (481)	ns	ns	*

TABLE II (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Column 1 Overseas Form A-2	Column 2 Domestic Form B-2	Column 3 Home Form C-1	Comparisons 1 vs 2	1 vs 3	2 vs 3
28	Roommate relationship: activities	m s n	1.567 0.724 (187)	1.453 0.595 (225)	1.676 0.777 (479)	ns	ns	*
28	Roommate relationship: discussions	m s n	1.378 0.661 (188)	1.329 0.523 (225)	1.546 0.746 (480)	ns	ns	*
28	Roommate: tolerance	m s n	1.885 0.810 (191)	1.836 0.733 (225)	1.889 0.804 (478)	ns	ns	ns
29	Attitudes towards the political policies of the U.S.	m s n	3.426 1.000 (439)	3.984 0.761 (252)	3.898 0.897 (628)	*	*	ns
30	Recommend program	m s n	2.039 1.063 (439)	1.415 0.658 (253)	2.620 0.992 (626)	*	*	*
30	Experience highly favorable	m s n	1.741 0.826 (440)	1.406 0.655 (256)	2.307 1.006 (625)	*	*	*
30	Best part of undergraduate experience	m s n	2.183 1.073 (431)	1.909 1.008 (253)	2.938 1.126 (624)	ns	*	*
30	Program valuable enough to extend college to 4 1/2 years	m s n	2.048 0.998 (438)	2.089 1.011 (257)	2.728 1.174 (622)	ns	*	*

Footnotes: Chapter V

[1]Statistical comparisons between the groups are made using t-tests or X^2-tests, where appropriate. Since comparisons are made over a number of items, the Reduced Alpha Method (see Chapter II) is used to control the Type I errors for each item and the overall Type I error. That is, for each item, the significant level for each comparison is set at .001/3 so that the overall significant level is – at most – .05. In Table II of this chapter, significant differences between the groups are indicated by asterisks (*), whereas non-significant differences are indicated by "ns".

[2]Means (m) and standard deviations (s) are calculated using the values ranging from a "1" for a positive (or "strong yes") response to a "5" for a negative (or "strong no") response. These calculations are based only on those students who responded to the individual items. In this table, the mean response (m), the standard deviation (s) and the number of respondents (n) are reported for each item. For items that have categorical response choices, means and standard deviations are not applicable and are consequently left blank.

Chapter VI

RESPONSES BY MATCHED PAIRS

In analyzing data exhibited on comparable items answered by the same students both *before* and *following* their sojourn – termed the "Matched Pair Group" – as well as by sophomore and junior students selected randomly on their home campus, the following statistically significant differences appeared at the .001 level.[1] Some non-statistically significant items deemed especially interesting are included and identified as such. There were 378 matched pairs for the overseas sample and 181 for the domestic sample. The home campus sample numbered 630. The statistics for the following paragraphs (numbered 1-49) appear in Table III.

Comparisons of Background Variables

1. When describing the majors of the students, the pre and post findings for both the overseas and the domestic program students differed only slightly between each group. When compared to the home campus students, however, significant differences emerged. Thirty-three percent of the overseas students and 32% of the home campus students had majored in the social sciences, in comparison to 72% of the domestic student sample. Nineteen percent of the home campus students majored in natural sciences, while only 9% of the overseas students and 7% of the domestic students chose this major. For education majors, the percentages were as follows: overseas, 11%; home campus students, 13%; domestic group students, 3%. As expected, there were more modern language majors overseas (4%) than in the domestic and the home campus groups (1% each). The home campus students majored in physical education more often than either of the other two groups: 13% for the former versus 11% for the overseas group and 0% for the domestic group students. Finally, the domestic group students were much more certain of having chosen a major (only 4% undecided) than were the overseas students (17% undecided) and the home campus students (15% undecided).

2. In terms of the type of community in which the student had lived while growing up, more overseas and domestic students (62%) had been raised in the suburbs than home campus students (48% of whom had been raised in the suburbs).

3. The amount of travel reported by the students previous to the off-campus program (or to the point of completing the instrument if the student was not participating in an off-campus program) indicated that both off-campus student groups had traveled significantly more than the home campus students. Fifty percent of both the overseas and domestic group students had traveled outside the United States. The majority of the home campus students had traveled extensively, but only within the boundaries of the United States and Canada.

4. Domestic program students were significantly more likely (26%) to have participated in an off-campus program prior to their present program than were the overseas program students (14%) or the home campus students (11%).

5. Off-campus students reported having attended significantly more concerts and cultural events during their programs than did home campus students.

6. Overseas program students and domestic program students differed significantly from home campus students in terms of having a roommate. Excluding those students who lived with a host family overseas and did not have a roommate, 51% of the overseas program students indicated they had one or more roommates; domestic program students, 91%; and home campus students, 77%. It is also noteworthy to indicate that 8% of the home campus students was married, while only 1% of the other two groups was married.

While the vast majority of students in all samples had American roommates, the overseas program students did differ significantly from the home campus students in that 5% of their roommates were African, while none of the home campus group had an African roommate. This was, of course, a factor of study location being in Africa; the overseas program students reported a significant difference in that 2% of their roommates were South American, while again there were none in the domestic program students or in the home campus student group. The domestic group students indicated that they had 1% of African roommates and none from South America. Two percent in both off-campus student groups had Asian roommates compared to none in the home campus group. One percent of the domestic program students had African roommates, in contrast to none for the home campus students.

Concerning the religion of the roommate, the overseas program students differed significantly from the domestic program students in that 56% of the domestic program students were of the same religion as their roommates, versus 39% for the overseas students. Conversely, 33% of the overseas program students indicated a religion different from their roommates, while only 16% of the domestic group students so responded. For the home group students, 53% reported having the same religion as their roommates. About one-fifth of the total population reported neither having nor practicing a religion: overseas program students, 23%; domestic program students, 27%; home campus students, 17%. Six percent of the overseas group was uncertain.

Comparisons of students' expectations and interests in the area of their studies

7. Students on overseas and domestic programs felt that their programs did provide the formal opportunity of studying the traditions and history of the local people in detail. Students on the home campuses significantly differed from the off-campus students and felt that their programs had not adequately provided any such formal opportunity.

Equally true was the fact that off-campus program students were significantly more likely to report that they had also studied the history and traditions of the area on their own. Home campus students had not done so.

8. While both overseas and domestic program students reported reading magazines, newspapers or books from or about the area of their off-campus study more frequently following the sojourn experience, a significant increase in reading was located among students who had participated in domestic programs. Overseas program students were not significantly different from the home campus students in this, but the domestic program students were. Upon return, neither overseas nor domestic program students indicated that the majority of the books that they had read during their sojourn pertained to the sojourn location.

9. Both off-campus student groups reported a significantly higher frequency of correspondence with individuals local to the area of their off-campus study after their sojourn experience than before.

10. Overseas program students began their study abroad significantly more interested in the local area than did domestic program students, although the latter group was interested in their location also, but to a lesser degree. Upon return there was no distinguishable difference between the two groups. The overseas program students showed a significant decrease in their interest of the area, while the returning domestic program students reported essentially the same level of interest that they had held prior to their off-campus study. Both of the off-campus student groups, however, returned significantly more interested in the sojourn area than did the home campus student group.

11. Overseas and domestic program students reported having spent a similar amount of time alone with individuals not a part of their college group, who were native members of the community in their off-campus location (21% to 40%). Home campus students spent significantly less time (20%) with individuals local to the community of their home institution.

12. Students on domestic programs significantly increased their desire to settle in the area of their off-campus program and work there, given the right job opportunity. Home campus students and overseas program students were less certain.

13. Overseas program students significantly felt that they had distinguished differences between values of their home community and the values of the local area more so than did the home campus students. While the overseas students showed a significant positive increase in this perception, the domestic program students showed no significant increase on this variable.

14. As the knowledge of the idioms and cultural patterns of the off-campus study location increased, students overseas and on domestic programs indicated more frequent contact with those native to the local sojourn area. Home campus students did not report a similar increase in such interaction.

15. Off-campus students felt that they were significantly more able to characterize fairly the local people of the study location following the sojourn in comparison to the home campus students.

16. Overseas program students became significantly less likely to feel that they would like to live permanently in the area of their off-campus experience following their sojourn than they had expressed before their experience. Domestic program students, however, exhibited no pre/post difference and were more positive on this variable than was the overseas group. The home campus group, in comparison to the off-campus groups, was the most negative in this regard.

17. The students abroad were significantly more likely to state that they wanted to work overseas for a few years than were home campus students. Upon return, the overseas students were more positive on this variable (at a non-significant level) than before departure. Although the domestic and home campus students were not statistically distinguishable, the domestic students were slightly more certain about wanting to work overseas.

18. Students returning from overseas and from domestic programs indicated that they were significantly less certain than the home campus students that their previous year's experiences were a definite factor in their interest in remaining in college. Off-campus students significantly differed from students remaining on the home campus, who indicated that their college programs were a definite factor in their interest in remaining in college.

Comparisons of students' expectations of their programs and experiences

19. Significantly, overseas program students were the least likely to feel that their programs should be oriented toward alleviating poverty and social problems at the study location. Students departing on domestic programs thought that such an orientation should exist, but returned significantly less likely to hold that opinion. These returning domestic program students were indistinguishable from the uncertain position of the home campus students.

20. Off-campus program students returned reporting that they had studied less than they had expected before departure. The overseas students returned believing that they had not studied harder during their off-campus program than they had on their home campus, and in this they were significantly different from the domestic students and the home campus students. The domestic students were significantly more certain that they did not study harder during their program than were the home campus students.

21. Off-campus students felt that they had had ample opportunities for unsupervised travel, but domestic program students returning from their sojourn were significantly more sure about this than they had expected before departure.

22. When asked if participation in an off-campus study program had been motivated by a desire to escape an unsatisfactory situation at the home institution, the overseas program students reported no pre/post change, the general response to the question being negative. A significant difference did emerge however, between the domestic program students when comparing their pre/post answers. These students returned to their home campus significantly more uncertain or neutral on this variable than before their departure. At the same time, overseas students were significantly more certain that it was not a motivation than were the domestic students upon return.

23. While domestic students were significantly more certain in anticipating that their programs would provide them with experiences directly related to their careers than were the overseas students; upon return, domestic students also maintained the same level of confidence in reporting that the program had done so and were significantly different from the overseas and home campus students. Similarly, returning students were significantly more likely to feel that their future vocational plans were clearer as a result of their off-campus program if they were on a domestic program or had remained on the home campus than if they had been on an overseas program.

24. Upon return, domestic program students were significantly more certain in reporting that they were able to view class differences during their sojourns than were overseas program students or home campus students.

25. Similarly, domestic program students indicated with significantly more certainty that they had also had the opportunity to view the way people behave as a result of class differences than did overseas program students and home campus students.

26. Upon return, both off-campus student groups were significantly more likely to indicate that there were differences in family structure between the local people and the people of their own home culture than were home campus students. Home campus students did not see any differences – which is not unexpected.

27. Upon departure, off-campus program students felt that formal study should be given to understanding social class structure and family organization of the local people as part of their study programs, significantly more often than did home campus students.

28. Participation in some social work or community activity was a meaningful part of the experience for domestic program students, whereas for overseas program students and home students it was not.

29. Skills in understanding the complex nature of the political systems either at the student's home or among the local people at the area of the study were felt significantly more likely to have been provided on off-campus programs rather than at the home campus, but significantly more likely on domestic programs than on overseas programs on post comparisons.

30. Off-campus programs were perceived as providing a significantly better opportunity for an in-depth study of local problems than were home campus programs. The domestic program students' expectations were met on this item, while those of the overseas students were not, to a significant level. Yet, both domestic and overseas students reported significantly more opportunities for such study than did the home campus students.

Comparisons of students' expectations of themselves

31. When questioned about their non-political attitudes, all groups were statistically indistinguishable, except for one comparison. Upon return, overseas program students were significantly less likely to describe their non-political attitudes as "conservative" than were students on the home campuses.

32. Students departing for domestic programs were significantly more likely to claim that they were motivated to join associations which promote solutions to political and/or social problems than were students departing for overseas programs. Similarly, students returning from domestic programs were significantly more likely than either overseas programs students or home campus students to feel that

the values and insights gained during their off-campus experience had motivated them to join such associations and organizations. The domestic program students, responding positively both pre and post, showed no difference in their answers. The overseas program students returned after their sojourn significantly less likely to join such organizations and associations.

33. Both off-campus groups felt that they had gained a better understanding of their own home culture significantly more so than did home campus students.

34. Before departure, when asked if they would consciously try to analyze and accept others different from themselves, both off-campus groups were significantly more likely to indicate that they would try to do so than were home campus students. Before departure both the overseas and the domestic program students were *very certain* that they would do so; however, upon return, both of these groups had altered their views significantly: they were less certain than they had expected. Returning off-campus students closely resembled the home campus students after their sojourn in expressing that they found themselves consciously trying to accept others when they differed from them.

35. Students were significantly more likely to feel that they did see errors in the way the local people perceived local and international issues if the students were on an off-campus program than if the students had remained on the home campuses.

36. Upon departure, the domestic program students reported significantly less confidence in their personal opinions and judgments than the overseas program and home campus students. Upon return, however, though not significant, the domestic program students reported more confidence in their personal opinions and judgments than before, and became indistinguishable from the other two groups on this item.

37. Overseas program students departed for their sojourn locations more expectant than the domestic program students of informal dating opportunities and of interaction in general with members of the opposite sex who were native to the sojourn location. Interestingly, both off-campus groups were more certain that they would have these opportunities than were home campus students. Both off-campus student groups returned with less certainty than they had expressed before departure that they had these opportunities during the sojourn experience. Thus their replies resembled the home campus students' responses. Returning students from abroad, however, still were significantly different from the home campus students in having been able to so interact with the local people.

38. Off-campus program students felt that their programs had provided less opportunity for them to relate with at least one member of the host culture and to become vitally concerned with him or her than they had originally hoped for prior to departure. On this variable, the off-campus students differed significantly from the home campus students, who were uncertain about this question. A pre/post comparison of overseas program students showed a significant difference, indicating that overseas students returned particularly disappointed in this regard.

39. Domestic program students were significantly more likely than the overseas program students to have indicated that, if pressed, they would align themselves politically with the host culture rather than with their own home culture on many issues. A similar question did not appear on the questionnaire for the home campus students.

40. Upon return from their off-campus location, the domestic program students were certain that they did not see their own home culture as more in a state of change than their off-campus location. These domestic students were significantly more certain in saying so than were the overseas students when comparing their own home culture and the overseas off-campus location. Similarly, the domestic students were also significantly different from the home campus students, who were not certain whether they saw their own home culture as more in a state of change than the culture of the people from the town or area surrounding their campus. Responses by the home campus students and the overseas program students were not significantly different.

41. When asked if their home college social life and activities seemed less important after their sojourn or year's college experience, the domestic program students were significantly more likely to say "yes" than overseas or home campus students.

42. When questioned as to whether or not students who had been on off-campus programs exhibited more social concern than those who had remained on the home campus, both off-campus student groups were significantly more certain than the home campus group. The domestic students were also significantly more certain about this question than were the overseas program students, although the pre/post comparisons from both off-campus program groups were not significant.

43. All student groups were uncertain if any change occurred concerning their own materialism.

44. Although both off-campus program groups expected that their off-campus experiences would force them to question their values, upon departure, the domestic program students were significantly more certain that their experience had forced them to question their values than were the overseas program students or the home campus students. The only significant difference within any group occurred in the domestic program student group, which returned reporting that they were more positive that their program had influenced them in this respect.

45. Returning domestic program students had a significantly more positive feeling that they were better prepared to cope with the "real world" beyond college as a result of their programs than reported by either the returning overseas program students or the home campus students, who were only slightly positive on this item. Returning overseas program students also differed significantly from the home campus group on this variable.

Comparisons of students' views of themselves and some students' selected opinions

46. Concerning the attitudes of the off-campus students toward the political policies of the United States, in general the students in the sample reported that these attitudes had become less favorable than they were a year before. Returning students from abroad were significantly more neutral than domestic program students and home campus students, who were negative.

47. In looking at the reported quality of the relationship between roommates, no significant differences were located, except that those students returning from domestic programs did feel that their roommates had included them in significantly more activities than did those students on the home campus.

48. All three groups did agree that the experience of living with a roommate had made them more tolerant and accepting of others. No distinguishing differences emerged on this variable. Similarly, students in all groups felt that their experience had made them a more tolerant individual and were now more tolerant of other people in general because of their experience, either off-campus or on the home campus. Returning overseas students rated themselves significantly more tolerant of other cultures than did home campus students, but not more so than did returning domestic program students.

49. When asked if they would actively recommend their program, domestic program students were significantly more certain than were overseas program returning students and home campus students. Students returning from studies abroad were significantly more certain than were the home campus students, however.

Off-campus students were significantly more likely to have felt that their programs were the best part of their undergraduate experience than were students who had remained on the home campus for the academic year. Furthermore, off-campus students significantly rated their overall off-campus experience as highly favorable; domestic program students responding significantly more favorably than the returning overseas students.

All off-campus students upon departure had anticipated that their off-campus experience would be such a valuable part of their education that they would go to school four and one-half years instead of four, if necessary, in order to fit it into their schedule. These two groups were significantly different from the home campus group in this regard. All off-campus students returned feeling that their program was this valuable. Home campus students were significantly more neutral about their programs.

Summary

In conclusion, these matched, paired students approximate precise indications of perceived change occurring during an off-campus sojourn experience. The results of their pre and post questionnaires can be compared (1) within each group; (2) with the other off-campus group; and, (3) with the home campus group in certain ways.

Many behavioral and attitudinal changes were reported. Values and traditional assumptions of students studying off campus were challenged more than were those of students remaining on their home campuses.

Domestic program students reflected the social involvement element structured into their programs. They became most conscious of American urban problems and attempted some solutions, like joining specific organizations which promote resolution of such problems. This same group expected more of its programs in terms of presenting career-related opportunities, and returned feeling that this objective had been achieved. Similarly, class differences and modes of behavior were most apparent to these students. There was a feeling of being more confident in their personal lives and of being more able to cope with the world as it is. These changes occurred less frequently in overseas program students.

Both off-campus student groups reported growth in awareness of others, of other cultures, and of other mores – as one would expect. Degrees of tolerance for the unknown and the different increased, whether the specific issue was the relationship with a roommate or a new culture's assumptions.

As a result, both off-campus program students recommend their programs more strongly than do students who remained on their home campuses. This recommendation is firmly underlined by the willingness of the off-campus students to add another one-half year to their undergraduate curriculum, if necessary, in order to participate in the off-campus experience before graduation.

TABLE III

Textual Paragraph Number	Item Description: "m" = Means, "s" = Standard Deviation, "n" = Number of students who responded [2]		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
1	Major	m	--	--	--	--	--								
		s	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	--	*	*	--	*	*
		n	(371)	(372)	(172)	(180)	(616)								
2	Prior residence	m	--	--	--	--	--								
		s	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	--	ns	ns	--	ns	ns
		n	(362)	(370)	(174)	(178)	(610)								
3	Prior travel	m	--	--	--	--	--								
		s	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	--	*	*	--	ns	ns
		n	(374)	(378)	(180)	(181)	(625)								
4	Prior off-campus	m	--	--	--	--	--								
		s	--	--	--	--	--	ns	ns	--	*	*	--	ns	*
		n	(378)	(378)	(180)	(181)	(626)								
5	Attendance at local concerts and cultural events	m	--	--	--	--	--								
		s	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	--	*	*	--	ns	ns
		n	(371)	(376)	(180)	(181)	(630)								
6	Roommate	m		--		--	--								
		s		--		--	--	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	*
		n		(374)		(181)	(628)								
6	Roommate nationality	m		--		--	--								
		s		--		--	--	--	*	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
		n		(165)		(165)	(482)								
6	Roommate religion	m		--		--	--								
		s		--		--	--	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	*
		n		(164)		(165)	(480)								

-- = not applicable (see footnote 2)
* = statistically significant (see footnote 1)
ns = not statistically significant (see footnote 1)

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description	Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS							
							Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
		Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
7	Formal study of history and traditions of sojourn area	m s n	2.606 0.972 (371)		2.754 1.096 (179)	4.087 0.982 (619)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
7	Informal study of history and traditions of sojourn area	m s n	3.151 0.925 (377)	2.851 0.816 (375)	3.467 0.812 (180)	3.067 0.966 (179)	4.006 1.041 (627)	*	*	*		*	*	*	ns
8	Reading of material from or about sojourn area	m s n	3.434 0.997 (371)	3.039 1.014 (359)	3.172 1.005 (180)	2.410 0.852 (178)	3.231 0.908 (628)	ns	ns	*	ns	*	*	ns	*
8	sojourn reading	m s n		3.169 1.140 (378)		3.142 1.132 (176)		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	ns
9	Correspondence	m s n	4.515 1.011 (365)	3.136 1.337 (279)	3.795 1.354 (176)	2.880 1.338 (158)		--	--	*	--	--	*	*	*
10	Interest in sojourn area	m s n	1.574 0.697 (373)	1.951 0.823 (371)	1.983 0.773 (179)	2.033 0.809 (180)	3.060 0.884 (629)	*	*	*	*	*	ns	*	ns
11	Time alone with natives	m s n		2.123 1.198 (374)		2.446 1.234 (177)	1.515 1.056 (627)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
12	Willingness to settle in sojourn area	m s n	2.552 0.904 (375)	2.505 1.123 (378)	2.392 0.908 (181)	2.144 1.065 (180)	2.652 1.202 (627)	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	*	ns	ns
13	Value differences between home and sojourn people	m s n	2.130 0.882 (376)	1.673 0.800 (376)	2.201 0.994 (179)	1.989 1.085 (180)	2.924 1.145 (622)	*	*	*	*	*	ns	ns	*

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
14	Language/time alone with natives	m s n		2.791 1.108 (373)		2.850 1.072 (180)	3.713 0.928 (624)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	*
15	Ability to fairly characterize sojourn people	m s n	3.197 0.813 (370)	2.396 0.729 (369)	2.904 0.887 (177)	2.390 0.810 (177)	2.804 0.959 (627)	*	*	*	ns	*	*	*	ns
16	Live permanently in sojourn area	m s n	3.147 0.700 (373)	3.379 0.937 (377)	3.169 0.858 (178)	2.978 1.073 (179)	3.396 1.047 (626)	*	ns	*	ns	*	ns	ns	*
17	Work overseas for a few years	m s n	2.308 0.913 (377)	2.175 0.947 (377)	2.369 0.979 (179)	2.391 0.971 (179)	2.556 1.100 (629)	*	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
18	Remaining in college	m s n		3.398 1.132 (374)		3.045 1.167 (179)	2.452 1.169 (624)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
19	Program to alleviate poverty and problems at sojourn area	m s n	3.606 0.814 (373)		2.780 1.026 (177)	3.253 0.911 (178)	3.160 0.966 (626)	*	--	--	*	ns	*	*	--
20	Studying on program	m s n	3.122 1.091 (377)	4.112 0.983 (376)	2.780 1.015 (177)	3.444 1.180 (178)	2.562 1.225 (625)	--	*	--	--	*	--	ns	--
21	Unsupervised travel	m s n	1.737 0.694 (376)	1.701 0.834 (378)	1.785 0.753 (181)	1.680 0.792 (181)		--	--	ns	--	--	*	ns	ns
22	Escaping home college	m s n	3.730 1.171 (378)	3.634 1.149 (377)	3.483 1.215 (176)	3.106 1.141 (179)		--	--	ns	--	--	*	ns	*

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Number	Item Description		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
23	Career-related experiences	m s n	2.272 1.075 (378)	2.629 1.181 (377)	1.724 0.773 (181)	1.737 0.800 (179)	2.373 1.062 (620)	ns	ns	*	*	*	ns	*	*
23	Vocational plans	m s n		3.214 1.103 (374)		2.240 1.059 (179)	2.489 1.105 (626)	--	*	--	--	ns	--	--	*
24	Class differences	m s n		2.298 0.985 (376)		1.459 0.571 (181)	2.356 0.958 (624)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	*
25	Class differences and behavior	m s n		2.588 1.059 (371)		1.564 0.549 (181)	2.402 0.992 (627)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	*
26	Differences in family structure	m s n		2.327 1.038 (376)		2.276 1.137 (181)	3.420 1.030 (621)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
27	Formal study of class and family organization	m s n	2.412 0.955 (376)		2.619 1.010 (181)		3.077 0.991 (627)	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns	--
28	Social work or participation in community activity	m s n		3.627 1.063 (375)		2.160 1.209 (181)	3.791 1.025 (626)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	*
29	Skills in understanding political systems	m s n	2.489 0.918 (378)	2.581 1.055 (377)	2.244 0.892 (180)	2.078 0.910 (181)	3.269 1.074 (625)	*	*	ns	*	*	ns	ns	*
30	In-depth study of sojourn area problems	m s n	2.676 0.925 (377)	3.101 1.043 (377)	2.117 0.791 (180)	2.072 0.917 (181)	3.789 0.819 (626)	*	*	*	*	*	ns	ns	*

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
31	Non-political attitudes	m	3.480	3.508	3.333	3.456	3.236								
		s	1.071	1.054	1.075	1.071	1.129	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
		n	(377)	(376)	(180)	(180)	(627)								
32	Join associations promoting solutions to political and social problems	m	3.043	3.376	2.678	2.639	3.309								
		s	1.054	0.904	0.958	1.063	1.061	*	ns	*	*	*	ns	*	*
		n	(376)	(364)	(180)	(180)	(627)								
33	Home culture understanding	m		1.894		1.955	2.717								
		s		0.836		0.866	1.080	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
		n		(377)		(178)	(619)								
34	Consciously try to analyze and accept others who differ now	m	1.798	2.465	1.955	2.384	2.242								
		s	0.632	0.774	0.660	0.821	0.947	*	ns	*	*	ns	*	ns	ns
		n	(377)	(245)	(178)	(151)	(625)								
34	Consciously try to analyze and accept others who differ during sojourn	m	1.639	2.003	1.728	1.955									
		s	0.571	0.684	0.556	0.694		--	--	*	--	--	*	ns	ns
		n	(377)	(370)	(180)	(178)									
35	Sojourn people: errors in perception	m		2.600		2.458	2.816								
		s		0.943		0.920	0.862	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
		n		(370)		(177)	(624)								
36	Confident of personal opinions and judgments	m	1.981	2.103	2.365	2.133	2.069								
		s	0.779	0.840	0.958	0.770	0.855	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	*	ns
		n	(377)	(378)	(178)	(180)	(627)								
37	Dating and interaction with natives	m	1.828	2.731	2.251	2.961	3.287								
		s	0.829	1.239	0.797	1.226	1.203	*	*	*	*	ns	*	*	ns
		n	(378)	(375)	(179)	(180)	(616)								
38	Relate to at least one native and become vitally concerned	m	1.965	2.463	1.883	2.171	3.220								
		s	0.793	1.143	0.762	1.066	1.203	*	*	*	*	*	ns	ns	ns
		n	(376)	(376)	(180)	(181)	(627)								

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Numbers	Item Description		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
39	Political feelings during sojourn	m s n		3.099 1.039 (372)		2.585 0.862 (176)		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*
40	Culture/state of change	m s n		2.971 1.058 (374)		3.704 0.913 (179)	3.117 1.085 (624)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	*
41	Home college social life and activities	m s n		3.231 1.172 (368)		2.544 1.249 (180)	3.141 1.244 (624)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	*
42	Off-campus students and social concern	m s n	2.611 0.908 (375)	2.637 0.951 (366)	2.206 1.004 (180)	2.022 0.850 (180)	2.936 0.936 (627)	*	*	ns	*	*	ns	*	*
43	Materialism	m s n		3.040 1.006 (372)		2.994 1.030 (178)	3.153 1.075 (626)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
44	Sojourn experience/ question values	m s n	2.204 0.935 (377)	2.213 1.067 (375)	2.017 0.895 (181)	1.788 0.933 (179)	2.372 1.110 (623)	ns	ns	ns	*	*	*	ns	*
45	Cope with "real world"	m s n		2.311 0.920 (370)		1.626 0.651 (179)	2.567 1.090 (619)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	*
46	Attitudes towards political policies of U.S.	m s n	3.546 0.976 (377)	3.479 0.990 (378)	3.772 0.882 (180)	4.011 0.747 (179)	3.898 0.897 (628)	--	*	--	--	ns	--	ns	*
47	Roommate relationship: interest	m s n		1.317 0.632 (164)		1.227 0.523 (163)	1.447 0.780 (481)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Number	Item Description		Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
			Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
47	Roommate relationship: activities	m s n		1.605 0.732 (162)		1.429 0.554 (163)	1.676 0.777 (479)	--	ns	--	--	*	--	--	ns
47	Roommate relationship: discussion	m s n		1.391 0.642 (161)		1.319 0.528 (163)	1.546 0.746 (480)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
48	Roommate relationship: tolerance	m s n		1.909 0.825 (164)		1.871 0.761 (163)	1.889 0.804 (478)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
48	More tolerant individual	m s n		2.136 0.852 (375)		2.168 0.842 (179)	2.152 0.964 (627)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
48	More tolerant of others	m s n		2.287 0.888 (373)		2.242 0.882 (178)	2.252 0.996 (627)	--	ns	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
48	More tolerant of other cultures	m s n		2.016 0.806 (372)		2.073 0.857 (177)	2.337 0.988 (624)	--	*	--	--	ns	--	--	ns
49	Recommend program	m s n		2.019 1.058 (376)		1.416 0.650 (178)	2.620 0.992 (626)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	*
49	Best part of undergraduate program	m s n		2.184 1.106 (369)		1.883 0.987 (179)	2.938 1.126 (624)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	ns
49	Experience highly favorable	m s n		1.735 0.839 (377)		1.436 0.691 (181)	2.304 1.006 (625)	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	*

TABLE III (continued)

Textual Paragraph Number	Item Description	Overseas Program Students		Domestic Program Students		Home Campus Students	COMPARISONS: Overseas			Domestic			Overseas vs Domestic	
		Form A-1 (pre)	Form A-2 (post)	Form B-1 (pre)	Form B-2 (post)	Form C-1	A-1 vs C-1	A-2 vs C-1	A-1 vs A-2	B-1 vs C-1	B-2 vs C-1	B-1 vs B-2	A-1 vs B-1	A-2 vs B-2
49	Program valuable enough to extend college to four and a half years m	1.928	2.013	2.211	2.066	2.728	*	*	ns	*	*	ns	ns	ns
	s	0.955	0.988	0.901	0.978	1.174								
	n	(376)	(374)	(180)	(181)	(622)								

Footnotes: Chapter VI

[1]Statistical comparisons between the groups are made using t-tests or X^2-tests, where appropriate. Since comparisons are made over a number of items, the Reduced Alpha Method (see Chapter II) is used to control the Type I errors for each item and the overall Type I error. In Table III of this chapter, significant differences between the groups are indicated by asterisks (*), whereas non-significant differences are indicated by "ns".

[2]Means (m) and standard deviations (s) are calculated using the values ranging from a "1" for a positive (or "strong yes") response to a "5" for a negative (or "strong no") response. These calculations are based only on those students who responded to the individual items. In this table, the mean response (m), the standard deviation (s) and the number of respondents (n) are reported for each item. For items that have categorical response choices, means and standard deviations are not applicable and are consequently left blank.

Chapter VII

IN-CONCLUSION

In considering all of the data generated by this project, including data from interviews and discussions with students, faculty and administrators since 1972, the following observations seem apropos:

First, it was quite clear that individuals changed and were changed drastically during and by various programs overseas, within the United States and at the home campuses; but the changes could not be attributed to the factor of location. Change seemed rather to be a factor of individual receptivity, motivation, openness, personal psychology, and chance experiences.

Second, in this study, no clear or general superiority of off-campus overseas programs was demonstrated over off-campus domestic programs in altering student-reported perceptions of the affective areas under consideration.

Third, in a surprising number of instances, more change was indicated as occurring during domestic programs than during overseas programs on variables long considered to be in the semi-exclusive domain of international programs. Although one must always remember that the Gestalt contexts of the various program situations are never identical, the following are some examples from the matched pair analyses:

1. Although students departing for overseas programs were, at the outset of their programs, more interested in the local area of their sojourn than those departing for domestic programs; upon return, overseas program students showed a significant decrease in their interest in the sojourn area, making them indistinguishable from returning domestic program students.

2. While both overseas and domestic program students reported reading magazines, newspapers and books from or about the sojourn area more frequently following the sojourn, a significant increase in reading was discernible only among domestic program students.

3. Students who had studied overseas and domestic program students reported having spent a similar amount of time alone with individuals not a part of their college group who were native members of the sojourn community.

4. While students returning from both overseas and domestic programs reported that they had studied less than they had expected would be necessary, overseas program students were most certain that this was the case.

5. Returning students were significantly more likely to feel that their future vocational plans were better defined as a result of their off-campus programs if they had been on a domestic program or if they had remained on their home campus than if they had been on a study program overseas.

6. Off-campus program students felt that their programs had provided them with less opportunity to relate to at least one member of the host culture and to become vitally concerned with him or her than they had hoped for prior to departure, but overseas programs students returned particularly disappointed in this hope.

7. Returning domestic program students had significantly more positive feelings that they were better prepared to cope with the "real world" beyond college as a result of their programs than did returning overseas students or those students who had remained on the home campus.

8. Although students departing for domestic and overseas programs both expected their experiences to force them to question their values, the domestic program students were significantly more certain that their experience had forced them to question their values.

9. All students agreed that the experience of living with a roommate during the program or academic year had made them more tolerant and accepting of others regardless of the program location. Similarly, students in all groups felt that their experience had made them more tolerant individuals and that they were now more tolerant of other people in general because of their experience, either off campus or at the home campus. Returning overseas students saw themselves significantly more tolerant of other cultures than did those students who had remained at the home campus, but the overseas students were not significantly different on this from returning domestic program students.

Fourth, preparation in a foreign language for those students studying abroad in programs not designed specifically for foreign language majors was seen as being too difficult and time consuming and really not worth the effort. Proficiency in a foreign language was viewed as an "extra," a skill which would probably heighten a student's sojourn experience but which was not necessary in itself. Profound dissonance existed between the students' attitudes toward foreign language preparation as a tool and some overseas programs' use of foreign language proficiency as a selection criterion.

Fifth, while students recommended their programs off campus to other students, they qualified their enthusiasm. "Academics" off campus were almost unanimously deemed inferior to those available on the home campus. It is necessary to underline that most students understood the term "academics" in the strictest sense: few included the notions of experiential or developmental education under this rubric. While described in varying terms, all of the off-campus programs investigated were judged by the students as essentially experiential in nature and of merit for that very reason. In short, this present research should be considered only the beginning of an effort for off-campus programs to define and exhibit their effectiveness.

Implications and Suggestions

Distance from the known and the expected does present opportunities for self-discovery that are unavailable to the undergraduate student on the home campus. If for no other reason than this, off-campus programs, whether domestic or overseas, should be encouraged to continue their development. Particularly in locations where a high degree of diversity between the home culture and the sojourn culture complements the individual's openness to self-discovery, increases in tolerance, broad-mindedness and self-understanding can be expected to occur. However, the mere transportation of the student from one culture to another – be it within the student's own country, or in a distinctly different country (either developed or developing) – is not sufficient. Off-campus programs should be strongly encouraged to pursue one of two directions:

1. A prototype might be encouraged to specialize its offerings in one specific area (or several areas), making the aims and objectives explicit to applicants and sponsors, and to focus on that area (or those areas) only rather than attempting to offer "all things to all people" as a means of securing enough participants to remain alive budgetarily. A few examples of this are: a program for the preparation of French/English translators; a program for rural agriculture in tropical zones; or a program for African musicology or art history. In most cases, such specialization would result in a decreased size of the program, with more reliance upon particularized faculty or staff from the sojourn area and with significantly less need for staff from the home campus to oversee the sojourn program. Quality becomes the objective, as the academic parameters are established and understood.

2. A second prototype might be encouraged to develop its offerings as a component of general education, appropriate not only at the upper division levels but also at the lower division, entry levels,

with specific recognition of the personal motivations and needs of undergraduate participants for developmental experiences with sufficient options and flexibility to meet these individual needs. Such a program would require the presence of at least one highly understanding individual skilled in group processes, with a firm understanding of both the home campus educational system and its assumptions and of developmental psychology of the post-secondary student, including present student desires for more intense "experiential" education.

Both types of off-campus programs are appropriate within higher education today. What seems unfortunate is the attempt to mix highly specialized assumptions and needs for particularized programs that are "capstone experiences for the *most* academically qualified," with the personal, departmental needs and motivations of participants that are related only tangentially to the program's goals.

The following specifics also seem to merit careful discussion within the educational community:

First, the establishment of an office responsible for Cross-Cultural, Inter-Cultural, or Off-Campus Programs on individual campuses should be considered in order to facilitate: (a) coordination between various non-residence programs [both those operated by the particular institution and those open to students from the institutions elsewhere] ; (b) educational development and assessment of program effectiveness; (c) development of pre [orientation] and post sojourn experiences, programs and seminars in order to assist in the educational and transitional adjustments of participants and to increase the meaningfulness and effectiveness of the programs; (d) selection and overseeing of personnel according to the educational objectives of the programs involved; and (e) initial recruitment and counseling of student applicants to place students in programs better suited and relevant to their own educational needs. Off-campus programs should be held firmly accountable for a contribution to the collegiate level education of undergraduates, developmentally and academically.

Second, an accredited course or seminar during the sojourn might be used to incorporate a weekly exchange period during which the notions of cultural awareness/change can be discussed and dealt with as emerging from the group. A skilled leader who is aware of group and individual development is required to focus on the informal educational process during the sojourn. Secondary purposes of such a course or seminar would be the articulation of program goals and a wider understanding of issues developing at present in the sojourn situation. Such interaction would also do more to facilitate direct student/program director contact. It cannot be stressed enough that the particular director of such a course is imperative to its success.

Third, an orientation program should be more open to affective concerns and dynamics. Sessions occurring before arrival might further incorporate and develop the following elements:

1. Students returning from the program in question (panel format) and *peer* discussion.

2. More reliance on an open question and answer period.

3. A program representative present *(but not dominating)* the meeting (i.e., serving as facilitator, presenting minimal historical and cultural "facts" as appropriate), and as a leader (i.e., not allowing discussions to fall apart or become too specialized).

4. A coffee/tea period for the applying student to meet informally with former program participants and with the program representatives for additional, personal questions, with exchange or posting of phone numbers for further communications.

5. More reliance on multicultural group techniques facilitating affective level discussions. For example, the Experiment in International Living does an extremely good job of introducing a discussion of cultural values, judgments and personal assumptions through a group dinner "in the land of the Albatross," which is duplicable on any campus and adjustable to specific purposes. Other examples can be found in the developing literature and techniques associated with what is often referred to as "Intercultural Communications Workshops" (ICW's).[2]

6. An atmosphere needs to be created in the program offices that will make the student feel truly welcome. This requires the skills of a very unusual director and staff, and also an office that is open and available to students as much as possible. The students should come to believe that the program is theirs, and not that they are simply filling up places to allow the institutionalized program to exist. The director bears initial responsibility to realize this atmosphere. In addition to informational matters and procedures, the program director might explicitly tell the students that his office and its staff exist to serve them. This would be done so that students would truly feel free to visit the office and interact with its staff, as often as they feel necessary. As trite as this may sound, most students in this project did not feel welcome in the offices involved.

Fourth, the selection and responsibilities of sojourn directors deserves serious attention. The following qualities and characteristics are not always as evident as they should be:

1. Experience with students, ability to understand their developmental needs, and a positive feeling toward them.

2. Experience with off-campus programs and experiential learning.

3. Personality: open and sensitive; willing to encourage close relationships between himself/herself and each student, without serving *in loco parentis* or as an armchair psychiatrist.

4. Enough academic background to gain a fair hearing from faculties, but not someone who is solely interested in being a director in order to do research, to escape a bad departmental situation at home or just to "get away." The director is primarily an *educator*. Trade-offs in particular disciplines just to meet institutional needs, without attention to the educational role of the director, are unfortunate if they are considered as a primary selection criterion.

All research posits the extremely important role of the director in terms of the educational experience of the student on sojourn, yet many programs do not come to grips with the importance of this position and allow reasons other than educational ones to be the overriding influences in the selection of a director. Many directors are never even told what to expect from the students for whom they are responsible, or what that responsibility means educationally.

Fifth, peer interaction with those local to the sojourn area as an explicit goal of the off-campus program requires more consideration. Ways of fostering such interaction differ according to each situation, but methods can be developed in each program to enhance such relationships. Utilization of local groups seems generally rather uninspired at present.

Sixth, predictive selection through psychological testing needs rethinking. The "best" student abroad or off campus in this country is probably the one who is most eager to go, who evidences maturity in the home culture, and who does not exhibit any major pathologies. We should seriously consider permitting students to self-select themselves for many programs. Predictive testing has not been successful, and there is no evidence that a high GPA correlated with a "successful" sojourn in any clear way.

The off-campus experience is unique and must be recognized as such. It should be structured and administered to effect maximum growth and change, through academic *and* experiential or developmental learning, which is not available on the home campus. Off-campus programs can make a major and unique contribution to the higher educational process, yet they need more clearly defined structures and more careful attention from administrators and directors. The mission of off-campus programs is the education of students. Other agendas should not subvert that mission.

Footnotes: Chapter VII

[1]Information on "Intercultural Communications Workshops" is available from the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, 107 MIB, The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260.

APPENDICES

A. Majors and Minors Represented in the Sample

001 Chemistry
002 Philosophy
003 Political Science (International Relations)
004 German
005 French
006 Biology
007 English
008 Physics
009 Pre-Medicine
010 Mathematics
011 Music
012 Anthropology
013 Religion (Theology)
014 Psychology
015 Economics
016 Pre-Dental
017 Chinese
018 Education
019 Sociology
020 Art (Art History)
021 Computer Science
022 Theater (Theater Arts)
023 Urban Studies
024 Black Studies
025 Human Relations
026 Asian Studies
027 Spanish
028 Home Economics
029 History
030 Communication and Culture
031 Nursing
032 Social Work (Social Welfare)
033 Conservation
034 Geology
035 Classics
036 Speech
037 Japanese (Japanese Area Studies)
038 Business Administration
039 Life Science
040 Multiple Major
041 Elementary Education
042 Secondary Education
043 Physical Education
044 Health (Health Science)
045 Social Studies (Social Science, Applied S.S.)
046 Agriculture
047 Architecture
048 Comparative Literature
049 Latin American Studies
050 Pre-Law
051 Chicano Studies
052 Oriental Studies
053 Individual Studies
054 Linguistics
055 Zoology
056 Indian Studies
057 Russian
058 Engineering
059 Fine Arts
060 Dance
061 American Studies
062 Technical Studies
063 Science
064 Visual Communications
065 General Studies
066 Multiple Minor
067 Related Arts
068 Police Science
069 Geography
070 Earth Science
071 Criminal Justice
072 Broadcasting
073 Accounting
074 Recreation
075 Journalism
076 African Studies
077 Community Studies
078 Environmental Studies
079 Botany
080 Inter American Studies
081 Archaeology
082 Interior Design
083 Environmental Design
084 Dietetics
085 Humanities
086 Child Development
087 Danish
088 Aesthetics
089 Comparative Cultures
090 Criminology
091 Natural Sciences
092 Physical Therapy
093 Fashion Design
094 Christian Education
095 Occupational Therapy
096 Languages
097 Industrial Design
098 Women's Studies
099 Photography

B. Foreign Locations Represented in the Sample

001	Legon, Ghana
002	Caen, France
003	Bogota, Colombia
004	Madrid, Spain
005	Nairobi, Kenya
006	Tokyo, Japan
007	Aberdeen, Scotland
008	Beirut, Lebanon
009	Mexico
010	Jerusalem, Israel
011	Vienna, Austria
012	Athens, Greece
013	Paris, France
014	England
015	Europe (several countries)
016	Durham, England
017	London, England
018	Basel, Switzerland
019	Dijon, France
020	Segovia, Spain
021	France
022	World Campus Afloat
023	Java
024	Taiwan
025	Leeds, England
026	Nottingham, England
027	Manchester, England
028	Birmingham, England
029	Singapore
030	Siena, Italy
031	Seville, Spain
032	Medellin, Colombia
033	Cuernavaca, Mexico
034	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
035	Salford, England
036	Copenhagen, Denmark
037	Tepic, Nayarit, Mexico
038	Hong Kong
039	Addlestone, Surrey, England

C. Domestic Locations Represented in the Sample

001	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
002	Detroit, Michigan
003	Washington, D.C.
004	San Francisco, California
005	Espanola, New Mexico

D. Institutions of Higher Education Represented in the Sample

001	Albion College
002	Alfred University
003	American University
004	Baldwin-Wallace College
005	Beloit College
006	Bethany College
007	Boston University
008	Bowdoin College
009	Brandeis University
010	Bronx Community College
011	Brown University
012	Bucknell University
013	California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo
014	Clark University
015	Colgate University
016	College of Wooster
017	Colorado College
018	Cornell University
019	Denison University
020	De Pauw University
021	Dickinson College
022	Doane College
023	Earlham College
024	Eastern Michigan University
025	Eisenhower College
026	Fisk University
027	Foothill Junior College
028	Franklin and Marshall College
029	Fullerton College
030	George Peabody College for Teachers
031	George Washington University
032	Glassboro State College
033	Gordon College
034	Goucher College
035	Hampshire College
036	Hanover College
037	Hartwick College
038	Hope College
039	Hudson Valley Community College
040	Indiana University

D. Institutions of Higher Education Represented in Sample (cont.)

041 Ithaca College
042 Jersey City State College
043 Juniata College
044 Kalamazoo College
045 Kansas State University
046 Kean College
047 Kenyon College
048 Kirkland College
049 Lafayette College
050 Lake Forest College
051 La Verne College
051 Louisiana State University
053 Mary Washington College
054 Middlebury College
055 Montana State University
056 Montclair State College
057 New College
058 Northern Illinois University
059 Northwestern University
060 Oberlin College
061 Ohio Wesleyan University
062 Ohio University
063 Otterbein College
064 Pacific Union College
065 Pitzer College
066 Pratt Institute
067 Queens College
068 Rockland Community College
069 Saint Lawrence University
070 Saint Mary's College
071 College of Saint Scholastica
072 Salve Regina College
073 San Francisco State University
074 San Jose State University
075 Simmons College
076 Skidmore College
077 State University of New York at Albany
078 State University of New York at Binghamton
079 SUNY College at Brockport
080 SUNY College at Buffalo
081 SUNY College at Cortland
082 SUNY College at Fredonia
083 SUNY College at Geneseo
084 SUNY College at New Paltz
085 SUNY College at Oneonta
086 SUNY College at Oswego
087 SUNY College at Plattsburgh
088 SUNY College at Potsdam
089 SUNY College at Purchase
090 SUNY College at Stony Brook
091 Stephens College
092 Syracuse University
093 Trenton State College
094 Trinity University
095 Tufts University
096 Tulane University
097 University of Arizona
098 University of California, Berkeley
099 University of California, Davis
100 University of California, Los Angeles
101 University of California, Irvine
102 University of California, Riverside
103 University of California, Santa Barbara
104 University of California, Santa Cruz
105 University of California, San Diego
106 University of Colorado
107 University of Denver
108 University of Hartford
109 University of Idaho
110 University of Illinois
111 University of Kansas
112 University of Massachusetts
113 University of Miami
114 University of Michigan
115 University of New Hampshire
116 University of North Carolina
117 University of Tennessee
118 University of Vermont
119 University of Washington
120 University of Wyoming
121 Union University (Schenectady)
122 Wabash College
123 Washburn University
124 Washington State University
125 Western Michigan University
126 Westmont College
127 Wheaton College (Illinois)
128 Whittier College
129 Whitworth College
130 Willamette University
131 William Peterson College
132 William Smith College
133 Wichita State University

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The American Experience in International Education

I. Research Studies of United States Undergraduate Students Abroad

Bicknese, Gunther. "Juniors in Germany: Effects and Opinions. An Experimental Evaluation Through Student Polls." An unpublished report, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, n.d. ED 042 390.

Burnham, Walter E. "Impact of Foreign Study on American Students: A Study of Some Attitudinal Changes of American Students Who Studied Abroad." Bloomington: Indiana University, 1966.

Churchill, Ruth. "The Effects of Antioch Education Abroad on Students' Attitudes." Unpublished paper, mimeographed, 1961.

Cormack, Margaret L. *International Development Through Educational Exchange.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1968. ED 023 334.

Dyresen, Dyre. "Non-Sponsored Study Abroad, Any Credit?" *College and University,* XLIV (Summer, 1969), 515-517.

Eggertsen, Claude A. "An Evaluation of Study for the University of Michigan Teacher Candidates at the University of Sheffield, England." Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, October 13, 1969. U.S. Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. ED 033 920.

Garraty, John A. and Walter Adams. *From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959.

Gorden, Raymond L. *American Guests in Colombian Homes: A Study in Cross-Cultural Communications.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, n.d.

Gough, Harrison G. and William A. McCormack. "An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad." Cooperative Research Project No. S-440. Unpublished research report, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1967.

Gullahorn, Jeanne E. and John T. Gullahorn. "American Students Abroad: Professional versus Personal Development." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 368 (November, 1966), 43-59.

_____. *American Students in France.* International Educational Exchange Series, U.S. Department of State, 1955.

_____. "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis." *Journal of Social Issues,* XIX, 3 (1963), 33-47.

_____. "International Educational Exchange: An Assessment of Professional and Social Contributions by American Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Grantees, 1947-1957. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1960.

Hague, Fred R. "American Field Service Exchange Students, 1963-1964: The Effects of Certain Variables Upon Their Attitudes Toward Selected Aspects of American Society." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.

Heisler, Mary Kathryn. "Factors Which Differentiate United States Students Who Wish to Study in Cross-Cultural Educational Programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1973.

Herman, Simon N. *American Students in Israel.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.

Kafka, Eric Philip. "The Effects of Overseas Study on Worldmindedness and Other Selected Variables of Liberal Arts Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Leonard, Elizabeth Waugh. "Selected General Education Outcomes of a Foreign Travel and Study Program." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1959.

McGuigan, F.J. "Further Study of Psychological Changes Related to Intercultural Experiences." *Psychological Reports,* V (1959), 244-248.

Morgan, Edward E., Jr. "The American College Student in Switzerland: A Study of Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972.

Oldt, Esther A. "Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation." *Antioch College Reports,* 10 (May, 1969).

Pace, C.R. *The Junior Year in France: An Evaluation of the University of Delaware – Sweet Briar College Program.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959.

Pfnister, Allen O. "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies." *The North Central Association Quarterly,* XLVI (Fall, 1971), 307-313.

_____. "The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities: U.S. Regional Accrediting Agencies Look at Study Abroad." *Occasional Papers in Higher Education,* No. 2. School of Education, University of Denver, December, 1972.

_____. "Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs: In What Way Should Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs Be Included in the Accreditation Process for Colleges and Universities?" Paper presented at the Annual Membership Conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange, Tarrytown, New York, November 21, 1969.

_____. "Impact of Study Abroad on the American College Undergraduate." Input: Research Bulletin. Denver: University of Denver, School of Education, 1972, 17-22.

Rishøj, Tom. "Semester in Copenhagen: Motivation and Evaluation." Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, DIS Study Division, 1973.

Schwaneger, Henry. "The Junior Year Abroad: Then, Now, and ?" *Unterrichtsprax,* III (Spring, 1970), 154-159.

Smith, Charles Thomas, Jr. "The Relationship of Program Characteristics of the Kalamazoo College Foreign Study Programs to Changes in Participants' Attitudes, Values, or Interests." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1970.

Smith, Howard Persifor. "Changes in Attitude Resulting from Experiences in Foreign Countries." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1954.

_____. "The Effects of Intercultural Experience – A Follow-Up Investigation." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* LIV (January-May, 1957), 266-269.

Spier, Paula. "Predictive Factors in Selection for an Overseas Study Program." Unpublished report, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, June, 1968.

Stanford University. The Study of Education at Stanford: Report to the University. V. IX, "Study Abroad" (December, 1968).

Taba, Hilda. *Cultural Attitudes and International Understanding: An Evaluation of an International Study Tour.* New York: Institute of International Education. Occasional Paper, 1953.

Tysee, Agnes N. *International Education: The American Experience.* Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.

Research Studies of United States Undergraduate Students on Domestic Sojourns

Beinstein, Judith with Stevens E. Brooks. "Urban Field Education: An Opportunity Structure for Enhancing Students' Personal and Social Efficacy." Philadelphia: GLCA Philadelphia Urban Semester. Mimeo. 1974.

Kiel, David H. "An Evaluation of the Summer, 1969 Resource Development Internship Program." Raleigh: North Carolina Internship Office, 1970.

_____. "Student Learning Through Community Involvement." Raleigh: North Carolina Internship Office (July, 1972).

Sockol, Richard A. "A Study of the Undergraduate Internship as a Factor in Law and Other Graduate School Admission Decisions." Amherst, Mass.: Center for Outreach Programs, 1975.

III. Selected Background Sources Relevant to Research on Off-Campus Education for Undergraduates

Angell, Robert Cooley. *Peace on the March: Transnational Participation.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1969.

Basu, A.K., and Richard G. Ames. "Cross-Cultural Contact and Attitude Formation." *Sociology and Social Research,* LV (October, 1970), 5-16.

Bjerstedt, Ake. "Informational and Non-Informational Determinants of Nationality Stereotypes," *The Journal of Social Issues,* XVIII, 1 (1962), 24-29.

_____. "Reduction of 'Barrier Tendencies' During Experience of International Co-Living." *Acta Psychologica,* XIV, 5 (1958), 329-346.

Bruner, Jerome S. and Howard V. Perlmutter. "Compatriot and Foreigner: A Study of Impression Formulation in Three Countries." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* LV (September, 1957), 253-261.

Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. "College and University Programs of Academic Exchange: Suggestions for the Study of Exchanges of Students, Faculty and Short-Term Visitors." New York: Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, 1960.

_____. "The Goals of Student Exchange: An Analysis of Programs for Foreign Students." New York: Institute of International Education, 1955.

Coelho, George V. "Personal Growth and Educational Development through Working and Studying Abroad," *Journal of Social Issues,* XVIII (January, 1962), 55-67.

_____. David A. Hamburg, and John E. Adams. *Coping and Adapation.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.

Cook, Stuart W. and Claire Selltiz. "Some Factors Which Influence the Attitudinal Outcome of Personal Contact." *International Social Science Bulletin,* VII (1955), 51-58.

de Sola Pool, Ithiel. "Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images." Herbert C. Kelman, Ed., *International Behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Dujiker, H.D.J. and N.H. Frijda. *National Character and National Stereotypes.* Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1960.

Eide, Ingrid. (ed.) *Students as Links Between Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Survey Based on UNESCO Studies.* Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Books, 1970.

Goldsen, Rose K., Edward Suchman, Robin M. Williams. "Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Interaction." *Journal of Social Issues,* XII, 1 (1956), 26-32.

Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. "Application of Psychiatric Insights to Cross-Cultural Communication." Symposium 7, New York, 1961.

Hoeh, James A. and Dennis W. Spuck. "Effects of a Three Phase Acculturation Process on Language Development and Social and Personal Attitudes of High School French Students." *Foreign Language Annals,* VIII, 3 (1975), 221-226.

Jacobson, Eugene H. "Sojourn Research: A Definition of the Field." *Journal of Social Issues,* XIX, 3 (1963), 123-129.

Kelman, Herbert C. "Changing Attitudes Through International Activities." *Journal of Social Issues,* XVIII, 1 (1962), 68-87.

Klineberg, Otto. "Psychological Aspects of Student Exchange." *Students as Links Between Cultures.* I. Eide, Ed. Paris: UNESCO, 1970, 32-48.

_____. *International Exchanges in Education, Science and Culture: Suggestions for Research.* Paris: Mouton and Co., 1966.

_____. "Research in the Field of Educational Exchange." *Students as Links Between Cultures.* I. Eide, Ed. Paris: UNESCO, 1970, 49-69.

Lambert, Richard D. and Martin Bressler. "The Sensitive-Area Complex: A Contribution to the Theory of Guided Culture Contact." *American Journal of Sociology,* LX (1955), 583-592.

McGuigan, F.J. "Psychological Changes Related to Intercultural Experiences." *Psychological Reports,* IV (1958). 55-60.

Mishler, Anita L. "Personal Contact in International Exchanges." *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis.* H.C. Kelman, Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Moos, Rudolf H. "Psychological Techniques in the Assessment of Adaptive Behavior." *Coping and Adaptation.* G.V. Coelho, *et al.,* Eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974, 334-399.

Riegal, O.W. "Residual Effects of Exchange of Persons." *Public Opinion Quarterly,* XVII (1953), 310-327.

Smith, Howard Persifor. "Do Intercultural Experiences Affect Attitudes?" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* LI (1955), 467-477.

Triandis, H., E. Davis, and S. Takezawa. "Some Determinants of Social Distance Among American, German, and Japanese Students." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* II (1965), 110-118.

_____ and L. Triandis. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Social Distance." *Psychological Monographs,* LXXVI (1962).

Zojonc, Robert B. "Aggressive Attitudes of the 'Stranger' as a Function of Conformity Pressures." *Human Relations,* V (1952), 205-216.